3:1 Pu.73:12.4 VIRGINIA SEMINARY LIBRARY Theology II 3

The CHURCHMAN

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF ANGLICAN THEOLOGY

VOL. LXXIII. EIGHTIETH YEAR NO. 1

Editorial

Draft Canon 17, the Ornaments Rubric, and the Dean of Winchester

The Oxford Diocese in the Eighteenth Century

The Hymns of A. M. Toplady

The Place and Purpose of the Sacraments

Book Reviews

For complete list of contents see within

MARCH 1959

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS LTD

DEAN WACE HOUSE, WINE OFFICE COURT, LONDON, E.C.4

2/6 *per copy* 10/- *per annum, post free*

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS LTD.

7 Wine Office Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4

Telephone: CITY 1484

EASTER GREETING CARDS

General Publications

BOOK TOKENS

SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSON BOOKS

BAPTISM CARDS

CONFIRMATION CARDS AND BOOKLETS

STUDENTS' TEXT BOOKS

ORDERS TAKEN BY TELEPHONE PROMPTLY EXECUTED

Book catalogue available on request

35mm. Filmstrips

FAMOUS PRODUCERS'

CLEARING

40,000 STRIPS

at

HALF PRICE AND LESS

RELIGIOUS TITLES

Also

screens

and filmstrip projectors

Lists available

D. Hughes

58 Victoria Road

London, N.4

THE WORD OF RECONCILIATION

has been committed by God to the Christian Church. This means that the ministry of the Church must have this supreme purpose controlling every impulse.

The C.P.-A.S. is wholly committed to sponsoring and supporting just such a ministry in the parishes and stands in need of your work, and prayers, and gifts.

CHURCH PASTORAL-AID SOCIETY

Falcon Court

32 Fleet Street, London, E.C.4

(FLEet Street 4341-3)

THE CHURCHMAN

JANUARY - MARCH, 1959

Contents

Vol. LXXIII. No. 1 New Series

PAGE

EDITORIAL 3

DRAFT CANON 17, THE ORNAMENTS RUBRIC, AND THE DEAN OF WINCHESTER

The Rev. Richard J. Coates, M.A. 5

THE OXFORD DIOCESE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY How the Clergy answered Dr. Secker's Visitation Articles of 1738

John Slee 16

RESTLESS ENDEAVOUR A Study of the Hymns of A. M. Toplady

Arthur Pollard, B.A., B.Litt. 23

THE PLACE AND PURPOSE OF THE SACRAMENTS

The Editor 29

BOOK REVIEWS

E. J. Young : *The Study of Old Testament Theology To-day* 42

Francis Foulkes: *The Acts of God : A Study of the Basis of Typology in the Old Testament* 43

T. Henshaw : *The Latter Prophets* 44

Leslie J. Tizard : *Preaching—The Art of Communication*... 45

C. H. Spurgeon : *Sermons for Special Occasions*... ... 46

Martin C. D'Arcy : *The Meeting of Love and Knowledge* ... 47

Edmund W. Sinnott : *Matter, Mind, and Man* 47

Gordon Hewitt : *Church of Free Men* 48

THE CHURCHMAN

Editor :
THE REV. PHILIP E. HUGHES, M.A., B.D., D.Litt.

The Editor welcomes manuscripts, which should be typewritten, double spaced, and on one side of the paper only. He cannot guarantee their return unless stamps are enclosed.

Books for review, manuscripts and editorial correspondence should be sent to the Editor, at

7 Wine Office Court, E.C.4

Subscriptions and all business correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers.

Price : Two Shillings and Sixpence

Annual Subscription : Ten Shillings per annum, post free.

In the U.S.A., annual subscription one dollar, payable to The Seminary Bookstore, Virginia Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va., U.S.A.

Publishers :

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS, LTD.

Writers in this Issue

THE REV. R. J. COATES is Vicar of Christ Church, Weston-super-Mare, and Lecturer at Tyndale Hall, Bristol.

ARTHUR POLLARD is Lecturer in English Literature in the University of Manchester.

JOHN SLEE is a writer and broadcaster, and a member of the Oxfordshire Records Society.

Editorial

AN editorial interregnum is seldom a good thing for a periodical, and certainly not for a serious theological quarterly. During recent months *The Churchman* has been without a regular editor, with the result that it has appeared under difficulties. We would like to express appreciation to those who, although already over-busy, have " kept it going " in the interim between Mr. Pollock's setting out on fresh travels to distant lands and the appointment of his successor in the editorial chair. We wish also to pay tribute to the admirable manner in which Mr. Pollock discharged his duties during the years of his editorship. Under his guidance the prestige of this old-established journal has been maintained at a consistently high level. It is our hope to continue this good work and to demonstrate that Evangelical scholars of the Church of England are alive to the trends and needs of our contemporary situation and have something relevant and constructive to say. In everything we shall seek to observe a spirit of genuine Christian charity and to glorify the Name of Almighty God, to Whose goodness and grace we owe all that we are and all that we have. May He be pleased to add His blessing to our humble efforts !

* * * * *

The far-reaching importance of the current vestments controversy was in effect acknowledged by the lengthy and carefully prepared speech made in the Canterbury Convocation by Dr. Norman Sykes (now the Dean of Winchester) in January of last year. Only after a delay which is as regrettable as it was prolonged has it at last become available in print in the *Chronicle of Convocation*. Upon its publication it was given careful study, not least by Evangelicals. The first article of this issue is an able examination and appraisal of the case for the eucharistic vestments as propounded by Dr. Sykes. We trust that Mr. Coates's comments and criticisms will receive the serious attention they deserve. Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics alike (not to mention Roman Catholics) have consistently maintained that, despite the disclaimer included in Draft Canon 17 as at present proposed, the vestments in question are in fact associated with distinctive sacramental doctrine. It is, therefore, undoubtedly significant to find Dr. Sykes confirming this view when he affirms that the alleged introduction of the eucharistic vestments after the Marion interlude " was designed to convey to the outward eye that there had been a shift of doctrine between 1552 and 1559 ". It seems clear, as Mr. Coates points out, " that Dr. Sykes believes that the vestments do signify doctrine and that they are meant to teach doctrine ".

Of course, if it were the case, as Dr. Sykes desires to persuade us, that the eucharistic vestments have all along been legal wear in the Church of England, authorized by the Ornaments Rubric, the long drawn-out debates, still not completed, in the Convocations and Church Assembly, have been so much wasted breath, and there would

be no necessity, as it is now recognized there will be, to obtain the authorization of Parliament for Canon 17 as proposed. These, at least, are considerations which appear to constitute a stultification of Dr. Sykes's interpretation of things.

The Evangelical opposition to the eucharistic vestments does not rest merely, or even primarily, on legalistic or historical grounds, though these have to be taken into account, as Dr. Sykes's speech has acknowledged, however much we may disagree with his conclusions. The main objections come under two heads : scriptural and doctrinal. Can anyone seriously imagine our Lord or His Apostles attiring themselves in such garments in the prosecution of their ministry ? And can it seriously be argued that they have no doctrinal significance when, in the proposed Canon, they are specifically associated with the Sacrament of the Eucharist ?

" The peace of the Church is hurt already by this Canon," declared the Rev. M. A. P. Wood in his Presidential Address at last year's Islington Clerical Conference, held during the selfsame week in which Dr. Sykes made his speech in Convocation. " We must walk humbly and courteously in all we do, yet remembering that the *truth* of the Church is as important to maintain as the *peace* of the Church. . . . If we hold our peace now, and let things go on in the way they are doing at present, we shall have ourselves to blame later for a changed doctrinal position " (*The Churchman*, March, 1958. pp. 7f.). And, speaking again at this year's conference, he said : " We cannot agree with what the new Dean of Winchester called ' the comprehensiveness ' of the Church of England, beyond a certain point, and we are very near that point to-day. . . . The door is being opened for totally distinct modes of dress to be officially recognized in the Holy Communion Service " and for " two distinct services of Holy Communion ". The Vicar of Islington speaks for many who believe that the issues at stake are by no means unimportant.

* * * * *

In our article (the first part of which is given in this issue) on the Place and Purpose of the Sacraments our aim has been to propound the doctrine of the Sacraments as it was held and taught by those great moulders of the Church of England, the Anglican divines of the sixteenth century. Their teaching must be viewed not merely within the historical framework of their time, but also, and more significantly, in the light of their resolution to return to an understanding of the sacraments that is consciously governed by the clear principles of Holy Scripture. In other words, their theology represents a desire to return to the source. Because of this, it has something of importance to say to the situation of our day ; for the great principles of the biblical revelation are timeless principles in the sense that they are related to man at the deepest roots of his being and need, and accordingly are always relevant and meaningful, however much outward circumstances may change.

The two shorter articles, which we are pleased to include in this issue, will be found to have their own special interest in two very different fields.

P.E.H.

Draft Canon 17, the Ornaments Rubric, and the Dean of Winchester

By Richard J. Coates

THE speech of Professor Norman Sykes, as he then was, in the January Convocation of 1958, supporting the proposed Canon 17, has excited much interest and concern. He maintained that the issue involved in the passing or rejection of this Canon was the crux of the whole of Canon Law Revision. If, he said, the Members of the Convocation in the middle of the twentieth century were not prepared in their revision of the Canon Law to maintain and act upon the principle of genuine free comprehensiveness which had been a tradition of the Church of England since the Reformation, the situation would fill him with despair. He argued that under the present Ornaments Rubric the Mass vestments had always been legal, and that, therefore, the new Canon would only express what was actually permissible under the Law. His implication was that the Church had always allowed either the wearing of the surplice only or the wearing of the full vestments. It is important to remember, however, that the comprehensiveness of the Church has never apparently allowed the puritan to go without the surplice.

In support of his contention that the Ornaments Rubric permitted the wearing of vestments, Dr. Sykes maintained that new evidence since the days of the Royal Commission in 1904 had been brought to light, chiefly by Sir John Neale, Professor W. P. M. Kennedy, and Bishop Walter Frere, which had revolutionized our conception of the Elizabethan settlement, and supported the view which he now maintains. The Law as it is at present understood is stated in Halsbury's *Laws of England*, Vol. Eccl. Law (3rd Edition, 1957), as follows :

Ornaments of the Ministers and Others

Construction of the rubric. The rubric as to the ornaments of the minister in the commencement of the Prayer Book prescribes that such ornaments of the minister at all times of their ministration shall be retained and be in use as were in the Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI. This rubric in effect reproduces certain provisions of the Act of Uniformity, 1558, which provided that the ornaments in use in the second year of Edward VI should be retained and be in use until the Queen should otherwise order, but the rubric makes no mention of the advertisements which were issued in 1566 under the statutory power above referred to and which limited the vestments which might be worn. The view was, however, accepted by the Privy Council in 1877 that the rubric did not repeal the statutory provisions or change the existing law, and that it must therefore be read together with the advertisements. Accordingly, the Privy Council held, while the general standard of ornaments of the ministers is that established by

authority of Parliament by the directions contained in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI, that the Act of Uniformity, 1558, and the Advertisements of 1566 thereunder engraft on this standard a qualification that as to the vestures of parish ministers the surplice, and not the alb, vestment, or tunicle, should be used at all times of their public ministrations, and that a cope may not be used except at the ministration of the holy communion in cathedral and collegiate churches (i).

Footnote (i) Ridsdale v. Clifton (1877), 2 P. D. 276, P.C. The Advertisements also provide that the dean and prebendaries shall wear a surplice with a silk hood in the choir, and, when they preach, shall use their hoods. As to the ornaments worn by Bishops, see pp. 80, 81, ante. Since the decision in Ridsdale v. Clifton, supra, further light has been thrown on these points by historical research, and a large amount of evidence was laid before the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, 1906 (Cd. 3040, para. 41, p. 10) in support of contentions that the decision is incorrect in substance (1) in holding that the ornaments rubric refers as a standard for ornaments to what was authorized by the first Prayer Book of Edward VI (it being alleged that the standard should be the standard in the second year of Edward VI before the first Prayer Book came into force), and (2) in holding that the Advertisements of 1566 ought to be read with this rubric. The commission, without dealing with the question, pointed out that the judgments of the Privy Council are open to reconsideration by the court itself, which will not only look carefully at the fresh light of facts not before it on a previous occasion, but will also examine the reasons upon which the previous decision rests and give effect to its own view of the case (see also pp. 331, 332, ante).

As the footnote makes clear, the Privy Council is always ready to examine again the whole issue in the light of any fresh facts which can be brought before it.

* * * *

Has Dr. Sykes produced any new evidence? We cannot find that he has. Professor J. E. Neale, in his essay on "The Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity" (*Eng. Hist. Review*, Vol. 65, 1950) introduces his subject by saying: "Let me say at once, that I have failed to find any new evidence to bring to the inquiry. It still remains a task—and how fascinating a task!—for the detective rather than the researcher" (p. 304). Anyone who is at all familiar with the circumstances surrounding the early days of Elizabeth's reign is aware of the great confusion which surrounded, and still surrounds, many of the actions of the Queen. If there is no new evidence on the question of the Ornaments Rubric, which, of course, is involved in the conflicting happenings of the time, then the question of its interpretation and its significance must be determined by certain clear and unshakable intentions which were revealed in both the legislation and actions of Parliament at the time.

It is a common and understandable mistake to seek to interpret the Ornaments Rubric as it stands in our Prayer Book in isolation from

the Act of which it is a part. When read as part of the Act it can be seen at once that it was a proviso with a temporary significance. The clear intention of the Act is stated in the earlier sections, where Parliament decided to restore the Book of 1552 and specifically stated the only alterations from the Book which were permitted. Penalties were imposed upon those who would not use the Book or who should speak against it. The following quotation from the Act will make the intention clear :

> *Section III.* And further be it Enacted by the Queen's Highness, with the assent of the Lords and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the same, That all and singular Ministers in any Cathedral, or Parish Church, or other place within this Realm of England, Wales, and the Marches of the same, or other of the Queen's Dominions, shall from and after the Feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist next coming, be bounden to say and use the Mattins, Evensong, celebration of the Lord's Supper, and Administration of each of the Sacraments, and all their common and open Prayer, in such order and form as is *mentioned in the said Book,* so authorized by Parliament in the said fifth and sixth Years of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth : with one alteration, or addition of certain Lessons to be used on every Sunday in the Year, and the Form of the Litany altered and corrected, and two Sentences only added in the delivery of the Sacrament to the Communicants, *and none other, or otherwise.*

The Rubric is taken from section XXV, which reads as follows :

> XXV. Provided always, and be it Enacted, That such Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof, shall be retained, and be in use, as was in the Church of England, by Authority of Parliament, in the second Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth, until other Order shall be therein taken by the Authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the Advice of her Commissioners appointed and authorized under the Great Seal of England, for Causes Ecclesiastical, or of the Metropolitan of this Realm.

In the Prayer Book of 1559, the Ornaments Rubric reads :

> And here is to be noted, that the minister at the time of the communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the church as were in use by authority of parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the VI, according to the act of parliament set in the beginning of this book.

* * * *

Direct reference is made in the Rubric to the Act of Parliament which was published in the Book. Incidentally, Dr. Sykes accuses Bishop Sandys of paraphrasing the Act because he used the expression " were in use " instead of " be in use " ; but of course this is not so, as the rubric which he quotes immediately afterwards had the words as above, " were in use " (*Chronicle of Convocation,* Jan. 1958, p. 35). If the intention, which seems undeniable, of the Act was to restore the Book of 1552, then the Ornaments Rubric of 1552 was restored by the Act. That rubric distinctly forbade the wearing of vestments other

than the surplice. It read as follows : " And here is to be noted, that the Minister at the time of the communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use neither Alb, Vestment, nor Cope : but being Archbishop, or Bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet : and being a priest or Deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only."

Any clergyman in the year 1559 before the actual appearance of the restored Book with the few minor alterations mentioned, could have used, and no doubt many did, his copy of the Book of 1552, noting only the changes mentioned. When, however, the new edition of the Book appeared, the Ornaments Rubric of 1552 had disappeared and its place was taken by the extract from the proviso as quoted above, which has since, with slight variations, been known as The Ornaments Rubric. The problems surrounding the insertion of this unauthorized Rubric are probably beyond solution. Some maintain, as for example, Dr. Gee, that the Rubric was inserted by the Privy Council as the result of the influence of some of its members who disliked Reform. Others incline to the view that it was inserted through the Queen's influence, and in support of this make reference to a letter of Archbishop Parker to Sir William Cecil in 1571, in which he says :

> . . . her Highness talked with me once or twice in that point, and signified that there was one proviso in the act of the uniformity of Common Prayer, that by law is granted unto her, that if there be any contempt or irreverence used in the ceremonies or rites of the Church by the misusing of the orders appointed in the book, the Queen's Majesty may, by the advice of her commissioners, or metropolitan, ordain and publish such further ceremonies, or rites, as may be most for the reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and sacraments, and but for which law her Highness would not have agreed to divers orders of the book. And by virtue of which law she published further order in her injunctions both for the communion-bread, and for the placing of the tables within the quire. They that like not the injunctions force much the statute in the book. I tell them that they do evil to make odious comparison betwixt statute and injunction, and yet I say and hold, that the injunction hath authority by proviso of the statute . . . (*Correspondence of Archbishop Parker*, p. 375).

When we consider the circumstances of the time and the confused state of religion in the country, we may well believe that the Queen herself may have sought, through the insertion of the rubric, liberty to deal with the question of the future use of the Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers at more leisure than some were inclined to grant. In the understandable reaction from the Marian persecutions, the people in many places were inclined to take the law into their own hands and quickly rid the churches of all Popish adornments. There can be no doubt that the intention of the House of Commons and the new leaders in the Church who later became its bishops, was to restore fully the Reformed religion as in the latter years of Edward VI, and to remove both the vestments and other ornaments which had come back again in Mary's day. The reforming party believed that the Queen was in full sympathy with their intention, but were often

confused and distressed by her vacillation. Nevertheless, if we take note of the actions which were, with her authority, taken in the country at large, we can see that the rubric could only have a temporary significance, and certainly not any significance contrary to the Act of Uniformity.

Dr. Sykes referred with approval to the conclusion of Dr. Gee, the Evangelical historian, that the rubric made perfectly legal the vestments, but he does not mention that in the same context Dr. Gee writes of the injunctions which were issued by the Queen's authority at the same time, and which he maintains were "further order" as envisaged by the proviso in the Act of Uniformity. He writes: "Under the direction of Cecil, as I think we may take it, the Injunctions of Elizabeth were drawn up. They constituted in some of their provisions a very patent modification of the Ornaments Rubric, indeed a taking of further order, and in their general scope, affected the services of the Church of England for many years to come" (Gee: *Elizabethan Prayer Book and Ornaments*, p. 137, 1902). This is the view taken by Archbishop Parker in his letter to Sir William Cecil quoted above, in which he says that the Queen "published further order in her Injunctions" under the proviso in the Act of Uniformity. (Parker's *Correspondence, loc. cit.*)

* * * *

It is maintained by Dr. Sykes that Bishop Sandys was putting a gloss upon the proviso which was not historically true when he wrote in a letter to Parker, later the Archbishop, at the end of April 1959: "The last book of service is gone through with the proviso to retain the Ornaments which were used in the 1st and 2nd year of King Edward, until it pleased the Queen to take other order for them. Our gloss upon this text is, that we shall not be forced to use them, but that others in the meantime shall not convey them away, but that they may remain for the Queen." Can Dr. Sykes produce any evidence to show that it was the intention of Parliament to enforce the wearing of vestments? Of course he cannot. When we take into account the actions immediately taken by the Injunctions we can see that there was no endeavour anywhere to enforce the wearing of the vestments under the new Act, but that the contrary action was taken. Sandys was one of the Royal Commissioners appointed who began immediately to implement the new injunctions which specifically forbade the wearing of any other vesture than that of the latter year of Edward VI. The Thirtieth Injunction of 1559 read as follows:

> Item, Her Majesty being desirous to have the prelacy and clergy of this realm to be had as well in outward reverence, as otherwise regarded for the worthiness of their ministries, and thinking it necessary to have them known to the people in all places and assemblies, BOTH IN THE CHURCH and without, and thereby to receive the honour and estimation due to the SPECIAL MESSENGERS AND MINISTERS OF ALMIGHTY GOD; willeth and commandeth, that all Archbishops and Bishops, and all other that be called or admitted to preaching or ministry of the Sacraments, or that be admitted into vocation ecclesiastical, or into any

society of learning in either of the Universities, or elsewhere, shall use and wear such seemly habits, garments, and such square caps, as were most commonly and orderly received in the LATTER YEAR of the reign of King Edward the Sixth ; not thereby meaning to attribute any holiness or special worthiness to the said garments, but as St. Paul writeth : " Omnia decenter et secundum ordinem fiant " (1 Cor. 14 cap).

In a letter to Peter Martyr, dated April 1, 1560, Sandys describes his activity as a Commissioner in the North of England under the Queen's authority. He mentions that on his return he was appointed by the Queen as Bishop of Worcester. One can hardly imagine that he would have been so honoured if he had been acting illegally, as Dr. Sykes implies, or if he had been acting against the Queen's real intentions. His letter, however, does reveal that there had been some controversy between the Queen and some of the Bishops in recent days concerning ornaments in the church. The following quotation from his letter will convey a picture of the situation :

" When I wrote to you at the beginning of August I was sent by the command of the Queen into the Northern parts of England, as an inspector and visitor, as they call it, for the purpose of removing the abuses of the church, and restoring to it those rites which are consistent with true religion and godliness ; . . . I at last returned to London. New labours here awaited me on my arrival . . . for my services were required by the Queen for the government of the see of Worcester ; and the episcopal office is at length imposed upon me, though against my inclination. . . . The doctrine of the Eucharist, as yet by God's blessing unimpugned, remains to us, and we hope will continue to remain, pure and inviolate. For both myself and my Episcopal bretheren will maintain it, by God's help, to the utmost of our power, as long as we live. We had not long since a controversy respecting images. The Queen's Majesty considered it not contrary to the word of God, nay, rather to the advantage of the church, that the image of Christ crucified, together with those of the Virgin Mary and St. John, should be placed as heretofore, in some conspicuous part of the church where they might more readily be seen by all the people. Some of us Bishops thought far otherwise, and more especially as all images of every kind were at our last visitation not only taken down, but also burned, and that too by public authority ; and because the ignorant and superstitious multitude are in the habit of paying adoration to this idol above all others. As to myself, because I was rather vehement in this matter, and could by no means consent that an occasion of stumbling should be afforded to the Church of Christ, I was very near being deposed from my office, and incurring the displeasure of the Queen ; but God, in whose hand are the hearts of Kings, gave us tranquility instead of tempest, and delivered the Church of England from stumbling blocks of this kind : only the Popish vestments remain in our church, I mean the copes ; which, however, we hope will not last very long (*Zurich Letters*, Vol. 1, XXXI).

* * * *

Bishop Jewel writing a little earlier, on February 4, 1560, to Peter Martyr states that the controversy about the crucifix is still at its height, and mentions that a disputation will take place on the next day on the subject between persons selected by the Council, and feels that he may not write again to Martyr as a bishop unless this controversy is settled in the right way, that is, unless the crosses, etc., which have been broken and banished, shall remain out. Another letter from Cox, Bishop of Ely, about the same time, states :

" Respecting our affairs, what shall I write ? By the blessing of God, all those heads of religion are restored to us which we maintained in the time of King Edward. We are only constrained to our great distress of mind, to tolerate in our churches the image of the cross and Him who was crucified ; the Lord must be entreated that this stumbling block may at length be removed."

Strype (*Annals*, 1. i, p. 260) records that Cox was greatly disturbed when asked to administer the Sacrament before the Queen (*i.e.*, in her chapel) because of the presence of images, and wrote to her about his conscientious scruples on the matter. It is to this particular situation that the letter of Thomas Sampson, which Dr. Sykes quotes, refers. He does not, however, make it clear in his quotation that Sampson is referring to what is happening at Court and not generally in the country. It will be as well to quote more fully from the paragraph so that its sense may be seen. Sampson writes to Peter Martyr on January 6, 1560 :

> Oh ! my father, what can I hope for, when the ministry of the word is banished from Court ? While the crucifix is allowed, with lights burning before it ? The altars indeed are removed and images also throughout the kingdom : the crucifix and candles are retained at Court alone. And the wretched multitude are not only rejoicing at this, but will imitate it of their own accord. What can I hope, when three of our lately appointed Bishops are to officiate at the table of the Lord, one as priest, another as deacon, and a third as sub-deacon, before the image of the crucifix, or at least not far from it, with candles, and habited in the golden vestments of the papacy ; and are thus to celebrate the Lord's Supper without any sermon. . . . I will propose this single question for your resolution, for I wish, my father, to employ you as my medium of correspondence with masters Bullinger and Bernardine. It is this : whether the image of the crucifix, placed on the Table of the Lord with lighted candles, is to be regarded as a thing indifferent : and if it is not to be so considered, but as an unlawful and wicked practice, then, I ask, suppose the Queen should enjoin all the Bishops and Clergy, either to admit this image, together with the candles, into their churches, or to retire from the ministry of the word, what should be our conduct in this case ? Should we not rather quit the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, than these relics of the Amorites should be admitted ?

He proceeds to ask that Peter Martyr, Bullinger, and Bernardine should write to the Queen, who he believes is a child of God, and with

whom their letter would have great weight on this subject. Dr. Sykes omits to mention that the complaint is about what is happening at Court and also that the letter bears witness to the fact, as do those of Sandys, Cox, and Jewel, that the same things are not happening throughout the country.

* * * *

When Dr. Sykes faces the difficulty which his interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric leaves, namely, why were the vestments not enforced in the country under the Rubric, he has to maintain that not only was the action of the Commissioners illegal but also that the non-enforcement was due to the fact that there were very few bishops. It is quite clear that the bishops who remained from the former reign were all opposed to the restoration of the Prayer Book and that those who took their place, among whom were Sandys, Parker, Cox, Jewel, etc., were men who interpreted the intentions of the new Prayer Book and the Ornaments Rubric in a sense different from Dr. Sykes.

Bishop Frere in his *Puritan Manifestoes* (1954 Edition, to which Dr. Sykes wrote a Preface) stated :

> Parliament might lay down certain requirements for chancels, ornaments, services, etc., but both civil and ecclesiastical authority were powerless to enforce them. The chancels and churches were devastated, the ornaments burnt and disused, the services discontinued. All this had taken place before the new Bishops had had the opportunity of assuming command ; and they never acquired sufficient command to recover a great deal that puritan iconoclasm had already swept away. Many of the Bishops and Ordinaries were themselves not sorry that the full requirement of Rubric and Statute was admittedly unattainable. The famous letter of Sandys of April 30th, 1559, seems to foreshadow a revolt against all the legal ornaments. It was only Court pressure that brought the prelates up to the point of wearing copes ; some of them would gladly have foregone even the surplice ; while the contest raged almost more fiercely about the walking dress of the clergy than about their ministerial dress.

Bishop Frere recognizes that the new bishops were not likely to enforce vestments and also that they did not desire them. He also recognizes that puritan objections were more fierce against the command contained in the Thirtieth Injunction ordering the out-door as well as the church dress of the clergy. *How can it be maintained that the puritan revolt would have been more fierce against the out-door garments if, under the same order, the full mass vestments were to be worn in church?*

Dr. Sykes has ignored the significance of the Injunctions and has treated the actions of the Commissioners as illegal confiscation. There was illegal confiscation going on, the people were acting without authority, and the significance of the proviso from which the Ornaments Rubric is taken, and by which the Injunctions were issued, was to prevent and restrain illegal action. Nevertheless, Bishop Frere's reference to the puritan objection implies that the order taken by the Injunctions was perfectly legal. Strype in his *Annals* describes many of the services conducted in St. Paul's and at St. Paul's

Cross during this period, and mentions that the Bishops wore the Rochet and Chimere.

* * * *

The reason which Dr. Sykes gives for the restoration of the wearing of the vestments in 1559, while we believe it is not true, is very significant, especially in view of the language of the proposed Canon 17. He states that the change took place because there had been *a doctrinal change*—" a definite move towards a higher doctrine of the Sacrament, a doctrine of the REAL PRESENCE, and it was accompanied by the disappearance of the Black Rubric. . . . This shift of emphasis in the doctrine of the sacrament was, he thought, interpretative of the Ornaments Rubric, which by requiring the wearing of the Eucharistic vestments, was designed to convey to the outward eye that there had been a shift of doctrine between 1552 and 1559."

It seems clear, then, that *Dr. Sykes believes that the vestments do signify doctrine and that they are meant to teach doctrine.* Those who are opposed to the Canon in its present form have always maintained this.

But was there any change of doctrine between 1552 and 1559? The Act of Uniformity by its full approval of the Book of 1552 implies complete agreement with its doctrine. The Black Rubric was not part of the Book as it passed through Parliament and was not, therefore, included. But there is plenty of evidence from contemporary sources to show that the doctrine on the Sacrament taught by the Reformers of 1559 was the same as that taught, indeed by many of the same men, in 1552. The speeches of the Roman opponents to the restoration of the Book, *e.g.*, Abbot Feckenham and Bishop Scott, show that they understood that its restoration meant the restoration of the same Eucharistic teaching.

As a Church historian Dr. Sykes must know that the term " real presence " (to allude to another of his arguments) is very ambiguous. Archbishop Cranmer and his associates did not like the term without careful qualifications because in their day it usually implied a substantial presence. By the time of the revision of 1662, however, the term had been used and was being used by many who undoubtedly held the Reformed doctrine of the Sacrament, *e.g.*, it is used in the Westminster Confession. Therefore, to have restored the Black Rubric in 1662 with the denial of the real presence of Christ would have amounted to a contradiction of the doctrine of the Sacrament commonly held in the Reformed Churches. There is much contemporary evidence in the seventeenth century to maintain this change in the use of terminology. It is important to remember that the Black Rubric was inserted not primarily to teach doctrine which was more clearly stated in the formularies of the church, but to justify and safeguard the practice of kneeling at Communion, and its re-insertion in 1662 was the result of a puritan request.

* * * *

The decisions of the Privy Council in cases affecting the legality of vestments in the Church of England since their re-introduction in the

nineteenth century, through the Oxford Movement, have upheld the view that the Advertisements of 1566, which enjoined the surplice only for all services, was a taking of further order under the Act of Uniformity of 1559. Dr. Sykes maintains that the Advertisements were issued on Archbishop Parker's own authority, unsupported by the Royal Sanction, and that therefore the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in affirming that the Royal Sanction must be presumed, had affirmed as a fact what historians knew to be a fiction. Archbishop Parker had, at the command of the Queen, drawn up these Advertisements to enforce uniformity against the puritans. Her letter to the Archbishop (*Correspondence of Archbishop Parker*, p. 233) gives him full authority to proceed according to the Laws and Ordinances provided by Act of Parliament. Both the Queen and the Archbishop were to act under authority of the Act of Parliament and according to the laws, usages, and ordinances of the realm.

There can be no doubt that the Advertisements in the matter of vesture reflected what was then the recognized lawful standard. The reason why the Queen at first refused her signature is unknown, but her later correspondence with the Archbishop does not imply that he had acted contrary to her wishes or contrary to the Law. Thus she writes in 1571 : " Where we required you, as the metropolitan of our realm, and as the principal person in our Commission for causes Ecclesiastical, to have good regard that such uniform order in the divine service and rules of the church might be duly kept, as by the Laws on that behalf is provided, and by our Injunctions also declared . . .," etc. (Parker, *Correspondence*, P. 380). It is not unreasonable to conclude, in the light of such a statement, that the Archbishop had the royal authority and consent in issuing the Advertisements.

Dr. Sykes sees a grave internal contradiction in the actions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of Hebbert v. Purchas in 1871, in that they considered that with regard to vestments the Advertisements of 1566 had superior authority to the Act of Uniformity of 1559, whereas, in respect of wafer bread, the Judicial Committee refused to allow the Royal Injunction of 1559, which required wafers to be used, to over-ride the Prayer Book Rubric, which said that ordinary bread was sufficient, because that Rubric was in accordance with the Act of Uniformity of 1559. Of course there is no contradiction if it is recognized that the Advertisements were further order taken with Royal sanction under the Act of 1559, and if it is also recognized that the ordering of wafer bread by the Injunctions of 1559 was order taken, but contrary to the clear requirements of the Prayer Book of 1552 incorporated in the Act of 1559. Archbishop Parker, who looked upon the use of wafer bread as a matter not greatly material but used it himself because of the Queen's Injunction, felt that those who refused to do so were wrong to set the Statute against the Injunction, and held that the Injunction had authority by proviso of the Statute (Parker, *Correspondence*, p. 375). It is hardly likely that Parker would have acted unlawfully in the matter of the vestments, he must have believed that they had authority under the proviso of the Statute, and he also believed that all that was in the Injunctions

had the same authority. He was mistaken when he accepted the Queen's authority where it conflicted with the Statute as in the case of the wafer bread. There is no contemporary evidence to show that any Elizabethan Bishop sought to enforce more than the wearing of the surplice as the legal requirement in the interests of uniformity. That was both maximum and minimum for the ordinary parochial clergy, while the wearing of copes was ordered for cathedrals and collegiate churches.

We are not aware of any evidence from Laudian days, either in England or Scotland, that the mass vestments were worn by High Churchmen. The Canon of the Scottish Episcopal Church governing vesture as late as 1839, speaks of the surplice as the sacerdotal vestment for all occasions. The Ornaments Rubric of 1662 was altered to bring it in line more with the proviso in the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity ; but of course, the note about taking further order was not included, as indeed it was not in the 1559 Book, and in 1662 it would have had no application because such order had already been taken. The Elizabethan Act was, with the new Act of Uniformity of Charles II, printed in the Restored Book, and it is still to-day to be found in all good copies of the Prayer Book. Its inclusion therefore is significant because it provides the standard of interpretation for the Book, including the Ornaments Rubric, and to adopt any interpretation of the latter which conflicts with the Act and its outcome in the Elizabethan period is inconsistent and unhistorical.

* * * *

In the concluding part of his speech Dr. Sykes referred in very contrary ways to the action of Parliament in the past, and its possible action in the future. He said that " for four hundred years the Church of England had relied on the support and protection of the State, and, because of that support and protection, the Church of England had been able to maintain, amid all the storms of theological controversy, the comprehensiveness which was one of its outstanding traditional characteristics ". Later, however, he warned some members of Convocation against the dangers which might ensue if they appealed to Parliament against the decisions of Convocation in favour of the new Canon 17, especially if such an appeal was that Parliament should overthrow the considered opinion of the representative bodies of the Church. Inconsistencies apart, surely there is a danger revealed in Dr. Sykes's words which he does not see, or feel, and that is, that the increase in vestment wearing amongst the clergy in the Church, would increase under such a Canon as that proposed, and so further estrange the laity, including Parliament, from a Church which spends so much time and money on unnecessary frippery.

The Oxford Diocese in the Eighteenth Century

HOW THE CLERGY ANSWERED DR. SECKER'S VISITATION ARTICLES OF 1738

By John Slee

(*With acknowledgments to the Oxfordshire Record's Society*)

CHURCH history, like social history of which it is a part, is often exposed to us in its most interesting and intimate light when we look at old local records. The events are at once brought down to a level of life which is familiar—the life in our own district or, in the case of the Church, our own diocese. Here are mentioned the places we know ; the characters who lived in them are thus invested with reality and their problems, although of no national importance in themselves, are usually symptomatic of, and can readily be related to, the greater events recorded in more pretentious histories.

To read, for instance, as I have just been doing, the privately published transcription of the Bishop of Oxford's Visitation Returns* for 1738—the earliest surviving in the diocese—is to receive a vivid picture of the quality of the religious atmosphere prevailing in England in the first half of the eighteenth century. It was an important period, for 1738 was the year of John Wesley's " spiritual transformation ", and the first seeds of Methodism were being sown at meetings in Oxford.

* * * *

First, however, it is necessary to know the circumstances and nature of Visitation in the eighteenth century—although it is still an indispensable part of Church government. Until this time, a bishop, visiting his diocese, relied mainly upon the presentments made by the churchwardens of their several parishes. These officials were required to answer articles of inquiry addressed to them. But as, in the process of time, these answers became more formal than informative, the bishops turned to the clergy, issuing to them articles of inquiry which they answered in writing to the best of their ability.

The earliest known examples of these are those addressed to the clergy of the diocese of Lincoln at the Primary Visitation of Bishop Wake in 1706 and Bishop Gibson in 1718. The returns made to Archbishop Herring's Visitation Articles for the diocese of York have been printed by the Yorkshire Archæological Society. Now the Oxfordshire Records Society have added those of Dr. Secker. These were his Articles :

> " Sir,
>
> Being desirous to obtain as particular knowledge as I can of the State of my Diocese, in Order to qualifie myself for being more useful in it, I send you the following Questions : under which, if

* Oxfordshire Records Society, Bodleian Library, 25/-.

you please, after making due enquiry concerning them, to write the proper Answers, to sign them with your Name, and put them into my Hands at the Visitation, sealed up if you think fit, you will greatly assist and oblige

Your affectionate Brother and Servant,
Tho. Oxford."
May 30, 1738.

1. What is the Extent of your Parish? What Villages or Hamlets, and what Number of Houses doth it comprehend? And what Families of Note are there in it?
2. Are there any Papists in your Parish, and how many, and of what rank? Have any persons been lately perverted to Popery, and by whom, and by what means? And how many, and who are they? Is there any place in your Parish in which they assemble for worship, and where is it? Doth any Popish Priest reside in your Parish, or resort to it, and by what name doth he go? Is there any Popish School kept in your Parish? Hath any Confirmation or Visitation been lately held in your Parish by any Popish Bishop, and by whom and when? And how often is this done?
3. And are there in your Parish any Presbyterians, Independents, or Anabaptists? And how many of each Sect, and of what Rank? Have they one or more Meeting Houses in your Parish and are they duly licensed? What are the names of their Teachers, and are they qualified according to Law? Is their Number lessen'd or increased of Late Years, and by what means?
4. Are there any Quakers in your Parish and how many? Is their Number lessen'd or increased of late Years, and by what means? Have they a Meeting House in your Parish duly licensed, and how often do they meet there? Do any of them, and how many in Proportion pay your legal Dues without compulsion? If not, do you lose such Dues? Or how do you recover them? And what facts do you know, which may help to set their Behaviour towards the Clergy, or that of the Clergy towards them, in a true light?
5. Are there Persons in your Parish who profess to disregard Religion, or who commonly absent themselves from all publick Worship of God on the Lord's Day? And from what Motives and Principles are they understood so to do? And what is the Number of such Persons, and is it increased of late? And of what Rank are they?
6. Do you reside constantly upon your Cure, and in the House belonging to it? If not, where and at what distance? And how long in each year are you absent? And what is the Reason of such absence? And have you a licensed curate residing in the Parish? Or at what distance from it? And who is he? And doth he serve any other and what Cure? And what salary do you allow him?
7. Is Publick Service performed twice every Lord's day in your

Church, and one Sermon preached? If not, what is the Reason? And on what Days besides are Prayers read there? Is there any Chapel in your Parish? And at what distance from the Church? And how often are there Prayers and Sermons in it? How often and at what times do you Catechize in your Church? Do your Parishioners duly send their Children and Servants who have not learned their Catechism, to be instructed by you? And do you either Expound it to them yourself, or make use of some printed Exposition, and what is it? Are there any Persons who frequent Publick Worship and are not Baptized? And whence doth this proceed? How often is the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper administered? And how many usually receive it at each Time?

8. Is there any Free-school, Hospital, or Alms-house in your Parish? And for how many and for what sort of Persons? And who was the Founder, and who are the Governors, and what are the Revenues of it? And are they carefully Preserved and employed as they ought? And are the Statutes and Ordinances concerning it well observed?
9. Is there any voluntary Charity School in your Parish? And for how many Boys or Girls? And how is it Supported? And what are they taught? And are they also lodg'd, fed and cloath'd?
10. Have any Lands, or Tenements, or Tithes or Pensions or Sums of Money to be placed out at Interest, been given at any time to your Church or Poor? And what are they? And for what particular Uses were they given? And are they carefully Preserved and applied to those Uses and to no other?
11. By whom, and to what Uses, is the money given at Offertory, disposed of?
12. Is there any other Matter, relating to your Parish, of which it may be proper to give me Information? And what is it?

* * * *

As might be expected, the answers to these questions vary from the mono-syllabic negative or affirmative to the vividly descriptive or long discursive. The outstanding impressions one gets from such a diverse collection is that almost all answers reflect the dire poverty of the parishes and often of the parsons; that the questions affecting Roman Catholics and Dissenters are approached tentatively and timidly, sometimes with pity and often with contempt; that funds from a good many charitable bequests have disappeared, apparently by way of the churchwardens. But it is above all clear that, if the parsons of to-day have many problems, the clergy of 220 years ago were no less embarrassed by the waywardness, apathy, and worldliness of human nature.

The Church continued to designate all Roman Catholics as Papists in much the same way as we, as a nation, used to designate all black people as niggers without implying hostility. But there is strong evidence to suggest that it was more afraid of and sensitive to the growing heterodoxy among the people of its flock.

Many clergy, in their answers, were at great pains to minimize the various sectarian breakaways by describing those concerned as " poor and mean ", " of inferior rank," " illiterate," or " only puny farmers ". The Quakers, for which Oxfordshire was a stronghold, were often poor but were treated with more respect, except when they refused to pay the parson his dues. Most of the Roman Catholics were either rich people or the servants of rich people. Many clergy excused those who did not come to church as being poorly dressed and illiterate, as if feeling for their embarrassment in a congregation.

Perhaps the most harassed vicar in the whole diocese was the Reverend James Edgecumbe, whose incumbency at Kidlington, Oxon., was tied to the Rectorship of Exeter College, Oxford. In answer to Question 10 he reports :

> . . . there are, moreover, sums of money annually to be expended out of ye Vicarage, three quarters of an Ox for a Breakfast on Christmas Day in ye morn ; at 3 or 4 o' th' Clock, and out of ye Parsonage and other Estates certain Quantities of Wheat and Malt to be made into Bread and Beer and which are annually distributed on Christmas Day in ye morn. . . .

(He then refers the Bishop to his answers to Question 12 as a continuation of the above story.)

> . . . they (the Parishioners) get up at 12 o'clock, run about ye Parish in a Tumultuous manner until 4 or 5, then go to ye Vicarage House, take their Breakfast not in ye most decent manner and by the time Divine Service begins half ye Parish are unfit to attend Publick Worship. The Beer mentioned in Article 10 is, I think, expended wholly on Christmas Day in ye morn and it is of no Service but to make half ye Parish Drunk before Church time. I have preached against it but have not been able to succeed. If your Lordship could think of any method of altering it to a better purpose it will be a thing of great benefit to the Parish.

The Vicar of Woodstock, a very ancient and Royal Borough, then containing only 240 houses, after reporting " scarce any Dissenters . . . formerly a pretty many Presbyterians and Independents but decreasing in late years as in most other places " went on to disclose " an abuse not peculiar to this place, but frequent in Many viz. by ye Negligence of Church-wardens and Profanity of Bakers and Vintners, ye Worst of Bread and Wine often provided for the H. Sacrament. Nothing being more common than to have ye former most Stale, or Coarse, or Musty ; and ye Latter, ye most Sour, or Vapid, that can be got."

This Vicar, who was the Rev. B. Holloway, attributed the decrease in Dissenters " not to any Extraordinary Increase of Knowledge ; or Regard to Unity, Order, etc., but to that general Decline of Zeal and Inclination to Divine Things in any Shape by which men are Nowadays become but too indifferent to Religion in ev'ry Shape."

* * * *

Perhaps the most moving appeal on behalf of the poor of his Parish was made by the Rev. Thomas Leigh, Rector of Heyford. He was re-

garded (says a footnote) as an exemplary parson, but he did not fear to speak his mind to the Bishop. After describing the state of his church in the following lines he pleaded for the people. He wrote :

> The Church wants whitewashing
> The Pavement of it is very bad
> There is no Paten for the Bread at Communion
> There is never a lock to the Church Chest
> The Register wants to be new-bound and fresh leaves added to it
> The Gates of the Churchyard won't keep out the Hogs
> The Church ways are intolerable.

Then, in a covering note, he says :

> I have acquainted my Parish with all the Things with which I complain of to your Lordship, and Beg'd of Them, that They might be reform'd ; but all my Intreaties, and even Threats to acquaint the Ordinary with it, have been to no Purpose. I believe, my Lord, it is not a Disregard to Decency, but Poverty is the occasion of these Things, every Penny comes with extreem Difficulty from them, and I truly think, that there are very few poorer Parishes in Your Lordship's Diocese. I hope your Lordship will excuse the Trouble I now give you.

He had made other complaints besides those listed above. In answer to Question 12 he wrote :

> The Ten Commandments with Moses and Aaron and other Ornaments painted upon canvas, are fix'd up between the Church and the Chancel, where formerly the Rood Loft stood. It looks ill, darkens the Church, and in its present situation is not legible ; I would desire your Lordship's leave either entirely to remove it or at least to place it lower or against a Side Wall, where it may be read.

Mr. Leigh, incidentally, delivered his answers by a roundabout way, " for," he says to the Bishop, " I am apprehensive that . . . my Parishioners may be suspicious that I have given some Information against them. This I would willingly Prevent, being sensible it will lessen that Influence which I wish and pray, I may always have over them."

Another of the many parishes in which religious indifference was reported was at Heythrop. Here the Rev. James Martin could not get a single person except the Clerk to come to morning service on Sundays. The Bishop, however, required him to hold one. To the Bishop's order, Mr. Martin replied as follows :

> The people of Little Rollright (where he also ministered) have lately adorned ye pulpit for me in a handsome manner. But to be Torn away from them and sent on a Sunday morning to Heythrop to read to the Church Walls (which I am sure would be the case, the Clerk only excepted) ; this, my Lord, is to me a melancholy consideration. . . . Nor will the reading to the walls be the worst of the case. I am already forc'd to be obliged to the Papist at Heythrop for a stable. If I am sent hither in a morning, I must either fast (which will put me into a fever) or be obliged to

him likewise for a dinner : (for no one will dine me) ; That will draw on me something of an acquaintance ; and that acquaintance will draw on me a fresh censure of countenancing Popery.

* * * *

Perhaps many of the answers put into its true perspective the present tendency to feel that the world is a much more wicked place than it ever was before. The youth of the time were by no means paragons of Christian duty and virtue. From Brightwell the Rev. John Edwardes wrote : " The Youth of this Parish are commonly guilty of profaning ye Lord's Day by Spending ye Afternoons in Sports and Diversions such as Cricket. I have endeavoured to Prevent it but to no Purpose. If your Lordship will take notice of this Disorder it will be a great obligation to Your Most Dutifull and Obedient Servant."

From Standlake it was reported that " many go fishing, many stay idly at home or go to Ale-house ". The Vicar of Bampton, the Rev. John Edmonds, deplored the fact that " Many of the lowest rank absent themselves from Publick Worship and with a View to Pleasure or Profit or Both ; others out of laziness, making it a Day of Rest in the worst sense ". At Little Rollright the " Young ones don't come to Holy Communion ".

The most general answer to Question 11 as to money given at the Offertory was either " none " or a qualification of it such as " none but what I give myself ". Some even went further and wrote, " No money given at Offertory Time out of Mind." Others added that if people were asked to give money at Holy Communion it would keep them away. Where money was given it was usually distributed by the parson or the churchwardens to the poor and needy who took the Sacrament.

The one mention of Methodism is a very important one. It comes in the answers of the Vicar of St. Ebbe's in the City of Oxford. He writes : " There have been for some time in ye Parish a meeting of about thirty people every Lord's Day in ye Evening who are called Methodists. The Persons who Frequent it are constant at ye Publick Prayers of ye Church and at ye Sacrament. Sometimes a Person in Priest's Orders and sometimes a Lay man of ye University meets them and reads them a Sermon or some part of ye Scripture and concludes with a Psalm and a Collect out of ye Common Prayer. I cannot learn that anything is taught contrary to ye Doctrine of ye Church of England."

This report is annotated from the Oxford Diocesan Papers which state that in 1767 the curate of St. Ebbe's wrote to his Bishop as follows : " I could wish there were as few Methodists (as Roman Catholics) but this little Parish has more than its share of them. I shall endeavour (as I know your Lordship's sense upon this Sect) to make use of all prudent and active means in my power to bring my mistaken parishioners into the regular and reasonable way of worship."

The same footnote explains that the " lay man of ye University " may have been a William Chapman who, in a letter dated September 3, 1736, wrote to John Wesley : " I read five times a week to a religious society in St. Ebbe's Parish." It is noted, too, that the great preacher,

George Whitefield, had also been a member of the same college—Pembroke—as that from which Chapman came.

* * * *

There are many amusing touches to the answers. The Vicar of Minster Lovell begins the first answer like this : " A very small parish old and ruinous gives title to ye present noble Lord Lovel." It is not clear whether the Vicar meant this as a snub to my lord or whether it was merely intended to prepare his bishop not to expect much.

In contrast, the Rev. John Ingram, of Chastleton, writes of his local gentry as follows : " The Families of Chief Note here are those of Thomas Greenwood and John Jones, Esquires. And I must do these Gentlemen the Justice to acknowledge that it is in a great measure due to their Care and Good Example that this Parish is Second to None in the Diocese in Point of Order and Uniformity."

Finally, there can be no more pathetic picture than that presented by the Rector of Rotherfield Greys, Dr. Hy. Barker, D.D., who writes explaining there are only four or five houses near the church, with the result that " Mr. Price ye last Rector us'd to toll ye Bell and wait for a Congregation till at last he grew tir'd and left it off ".

Restless Endeavour

A STUDY OF THE HYMNS OF A. M. TOPLADY

By Arthur Pollard

AUGUSTUS MONTAGUE TOPLADY is to-day remembered, if at all, as the writer of a single hymn, " Rock of Ages ". In his own day he was noted chiefly as a controversialist, prominent in that sad division among Evangelicals which marred the progress of the Revival. Toplady was a Calvinist, bitterly opposed to Wesley. The chief of his works, *Historic Proof of the Calvinism of the Church of England* (1775), was considered by Bishop Ryle as unanswerable.

This is a short essay on Toplady as a hymn-writer, but I mention this polemical activity because the picture of Toplady as a hymn-writer would not be complete without it. And yet, though this reference is essential, the final picture is supreme testimony to the manner in which Toplady's full Christian experience was a much vaster and more beautiful thing than any polemic assertion of doctrine can ever be. No hymn ever lived through its doctrine merely, but many cannot be fully appreciated unless the importance of their doctrinal statement is realized. Calvinism suited Toplady. His own tendency to see things in black and white, to envisage stark opposition, his own fervour and sense of the dramatic, were exactly of a kind to rejoice in the faith he avowed. At times indeed the doctrine seems rather crudely imposed on a hymn, as in the lines :

> My Robe thou art, I feel thy Grace
> And triumph in my Righteousness
> Made mine by Imputation.
>
> (Section 2, VI)*

Even in a better example the controversial note is clearly detected :

> Repentance, Holiness and Faith
> By which to Thee we live,
> Are not Conditions we perform,
> But Graces we receive.
>
> (Occasional Hymns, V)

Toplady was perhaps trying to use the hymn as a teaching medium, but it can never satisfy such a purpose. When, however, doctrine is a convincing formulation of experience, the results are more felicitous :

> How happy are we :
> Our Election we see,
> And can venture our Souls on thy gracious Decree.
> In Jesus approv'd,
> For Eternity lov'd,
> And lodg'd in his Hand, whence we cannot be mov'd.
>
> (*ibid.*, II)

This sounds indeed, as its title states, " Faith Triumphant ". The writer's joy and confidence are evident in the fine lilting measure which the 5.6.12 arrangement, emphasized by the repeated rhyme of all

* All references are to Toplady's *Hymns and Sacred Poems* (Sedgwick, 1860).

three lines, provides. An even better, and better-known, example of this fusion of doctrine and experience is in the couplet :

> Nothing in my Hand I bring,
> Simply to thy Cross I cling
>
> (*ibid.*, XXIII)

where the assertion of all-sufficient grace co-exists alongside a convincing indication of humility. Contrast this with the insincere grovelling of another writer's

> Oh, to be nothing, nothing !
> Painful the humbling may be,
> Yet low in the dust I'd lay me
> That the world might my Saviour see.

The great difference, of course, between these passages is that one pretends to narrate a willed, but difficult, subjugation, whereas the other in crisp, economical phrase suggests a more active and ready response.

This is indeed the key to Toplady's achievement. The whole of his own spiritual experience and of the economy of God is realized in active terms. It is a drama working out for the prize of a soul. When he elaborates the passage quoted above, it is no mere expansion. Every detail adds to the significance of the whole :

> Naked, come to Thee for Dress ;
> Helpless, look to Thee for Grace ;
> Foul, I to the Fountain fly ;
> Wash me, Saviour, or I die !

Each line concisely contrasts need and supply, and as each line follows the one before, the need not merely accumulates but becomes more desperate, until he reaches the urgent plea and dire alternative of the final line. Toplady was active enough himself ; but with his beliefs God had to be amazingly active. Is it too subtle to read the imperative of the final line as a mixture of pathetic plea and desperate command ?

There is in Toplady a kind of Augustinian restlessness for ever seeking that single effectual rest which is in God. To this may be ascribed much of that peculiar pervasive violence in his work, and from it also there comes the singular beauty of Toplady's contemplation of death and its aftermath. The stark, elemental perspective of " Rock of Ages " prevents the full expression of this latter feature in that hymn. The emotions are too highly pitched even for raptured vision there. He can only seek to hide himself in God. But there is all the urgency and fevered activity there. In one of his hymns he pleads :

> Lead me to Jesus for Peace,
> The Rock that is higher than I.
>
> (*ibid.*, XV),

but *this* encounter with the Rock is not a pacifying, but a blinding experience. He finds the Rock that is " cleft ", the Saviour with the " riven " side. Toplady's vision of the cross is not of sorrow and love, but of terrifying suffering. There is a fine paradoxical relationship later in the hymn between the penultimate and final verses. He

pleads for the Saviour's washing to rescue him from death, and then immediately there follows :

> While I draw this fleeting breath,
> When my Eyestrings break in Death . . .,

lines again with a terrifying vividness of physical suffering, but this time Toplady's, not his Saviour's. Then again without a pause the stress shifts :

> When I soar through Tracts unknown,
> See Thee on Thy Judgment Throne

—from one kind of terror to another. Here the terror is more that of scene and action than of feeling. That is, it has become externalized, and thereby to a known suffering there is added an unknown. Those "Tracts unknown" are desert vastnesses of unimaginable consequence. How much more telling than the perhaps more cosmically correct "refinement" of this line in our modern hymn-books to "worlds unknown"! Even the verb "soar" has, besides its suggestions of triumph, some overtones of helplessness. Certainly, it is not so unambiguous as the use of the same word in :

> Deathless Principle, arise !
> Soar, thou Native of the Skies.
>
> (*ibid.*, XXV)

This hymn is one of those which display Toplady's confidence through death. He has no fears because he knows he can hide himself in Christ :

> Lo, He beckons from on high !
> Fearless to His Presence fly !

The poet's restlessness and the rest in God are finely expressed in this hymn. He bids his soul,

> Fly, celestial Tenant, fly !
> Burst thy Shackles, drop thy Clay.

that it may pass upon the sea that God has calmed,

> Still'd its Tossing, hush'd its Roar.
>
> Safe is the expanded Wave,
> Gentle as a summer's Eve
> Not one Object of His Care
> Ever suffered Shipwreck there.
>
> See the Haven full in view ;
> Love Divine shall bear thee through ;
> Trust to that propitious Gale ;
> Weigh thy Anchor, spread thy Sail.

Here is the peace and rest and joy which only the most active most richly contemplate. In an even better example, with lyric sweetness long drawn out, Toplady, writing during one of his illnesses, contemplated the passage to his heavenly home. In "When languor and disease invade" (*ibid.*, XXIV), a long hymn held together with wonderful tautness, he first reflects on past and present blessings and then looks forward to his fast approaching bliss and onward still to the final resurrection. This last he describes as follows :

Soon, too, my slumbering Dust shall hear
The Trumpet's quickening sound ;
And by my Saviour's Power rebuilt,
At His right Hand be found.

These Eyes shall see Him in that Day,
The God that died for me !
And all my rising Bones shall say,
Lord, who is like to Thee ?

In his preface Toplady wrote : " That the Dignity of Truths so momentous might be impair'd as little as possible by the manner of expressing them, they are often introduced in the *very Words* of the inspir'd writers and our venerable Reformers." " When langour and disease invade " is headed with a reference to Psalm 104: 34—" My meditation of him shall be sweet "—and the various blessings of the first eight verses are recollected as " sweet ". In the passage which I quote above there is another reference to the psalms, namely, to Psalm 35: 10—" All my bones shall say, Lord, who is like unto thee ? " But no mere fidelity to Scripture could suffice to produce a vivid rendering. Toplady, however, could be both faithful and original, startlingly original. The bones became " rising bones "—again, the active, dramatic vision of things, yet not so incongruous because not so particularized as Dryden's

" rattling bones together fly
From the four corners of the sky."
(Ode ; To the Pious Memory of Mrs. Anne Killigrew.)

Perhaps also the consonance of " rising " with our image of the Resurrection helps Toplady. (And was he also helped by recollection of the valley of dry bones in Ezekiel 37 ?)

Toplady is, not surprisingly, fond of quoting the vivid references of Scripture, such as, for example, the borrowing from Jeremiah (13: 23), himself, of course, a writer full of vivid images :

Thy Blood's renewing Might
Can make the foulest clean,
Can wash the Ethiopian white,
And change the Leopard's skin.

(Section 1, XXIV)

But Toplady does not always rest content with Scripture, or even with imagery that can be closely related to that of Scripture. The storm and the haven of marine imagery are popular with him, and in one case he produces a striking effect by a sudden particularization of a very general reference :

My Sins, at my Command, shall be
Cast as a Stone into the Sea—
The Sea of Jesus' Blood.

The effect is stunning, because that was how Toplady himself had known it. His religious experience was always like that, close, immediate, intimate.

His controversial bitterness may well have been the result of some sort of hypersensitive sincerity about this intimate experience. It would certainly appear so from the following verse in " Your Lamps, ye foolish Virgins, trim " (Section 3, V) :

Hath Satan giv'n a sleeping Draught,
And so become your Lord ?
Or has he shot a poison'd Shaft
And are your Wounds uncur'd ?
To JESUS fly, the living Stream,
And find your Antidote in Him.

The imagery is here used tellingly to enforce his criticism. How could they so casually neglect the great salvation which he so wonderingly possessed in mingled awe and exultation ?

No consideration of Toplady's imagery can avoid discussion of his notoriously mixed references. They are found in " Rock of Ages ", where the first idea is of the rock as protection (suggested, I think, by Isaiah 32: 2), but is quickly followed by the parallel of the rock which Moses struck for life-giving water (Exodus 17: 6) and our Lord's torn side whence blood and water flowed (John 19: 34). There seems to be an arbitrariness about the transitions that proceeds from merely verbal associations of rock and flowing water. Toplady, however, so strongly feels the implication of his references both in isolation and together that there is no sense of incongruity.

An even more outstanding example of mixed imagery is provided by the hymn, " Deathless Principle, arise ". Here in a passage I have already quoted he imagines the soul as a " celestial tenant " in an earthly house about to fly off like a bird. It then becomes a prisoner bursting its shackles, then more conventionally it drops its clay and breathes itself away, only to become a monarch removing to its crown. It crosses a stream, which tosses and roars, has expanded waves and has witnessed shipwreck. By now the ocean image has taken control and the soul is bidden to see its haven and, thus doing, to trust to the wind, weigh anchor and spread sail. Yet so obviously does Toplady feel, and make his readers feel, the passion in his subject that we do not find the imagery disturbing. The mixed imagery also appears in the first lines of the hymn :

Deathless Principle, arise !
Soar, thou Native of the Skies ;
Pearl of price, by Jesus bought,
To his glorious Likeness wrought !

Go, to shine before His Throne ;
Deck His mediatorial Crown.

A principle is bidden to soar, a pearl to go and shine before God. This is an interesting example of what I may call " active inanimates ". It is interesting because it provides a kind of reflection of Toplady's theology. As a Calvinist he asserted the utter helplessness of man and the all-sufficient power of God's predestinating grace. The pearl and the principle become active, as it were, by God's animating power.

This mixture of imagery may, however, be in some way related to that restlessness which marks the whole of Toplady's writing and made him so much desire that peace beneath the shadow of the rock of his Saviour. This restlessness makes his spiritual experience so dramatic. Look at the titles of some of the hymns. One moment it is " Faith Triumphant " (" How happy are we," Occasional Hymns, II), then it is " Faith fainting " (" Encompass'd with Clouds of

Distress," *ibid.*, XV), and then "Faith Reviving" ("From whence this Fear and Unbelief," *ibid.*, XVI). Or compare again the fluctuation between "Full Assurance" ("A Debtor to Mercy alone," *ibid.*, IV), "Weak Believers Encouraged" ("Your Harps, ye trembling Saints," *ibid.*, XVII) and "Happiness Found" ("Happiness, thou lovely Name," *ibid.*, XIX). There could be no relaxing in his spiritual journey :

> If sometimes I strive, as I mourn,
> My Hold of thy Promise to keep.
> The Billows more fiercely return,
> And plunge me again in the Deep.
> While harass'd and cast from thy Sight,
> The Tempter suggests with a Roar,
> "The Lord hath forsaken thee quite :
> Thy God will be gracious no more."
>
> (*ibid.*, XV) ;

but such sentiments quickly bring the sternly questioning reply :

> From whence this Fear and Unbelief ?
> Hath not the Father put to Grief
> His spotless Son for me ?
> And will the righteous Judge of Men
> Condemn me for that Debt of Sin,
> Which, Lord, was charg'd on Thee ?
>
> (*ibid.*, XVI)

The struggle and temptation was always close and persistent in Toplady's spiritual experience. Hence perhaps the frequency of violent, almost masochistic, imprecations :

> The Idols tread beneath thy Feet,
> And to Thyself the Conquest get . . .
> Compel my Soul thy sway to own.
>
> (Section 1, XXV)

> Tear away my every Boast,
> My stubborn Mind abase
>
> (Section 1, XLI)

Toplady had no faith in a merely persuading Deity ; his God was all-subduing Power Divine (Occasional Hymns, III). Such a God could alone avail for a man with Toplady's sense of sin,

> Foul as I am, and ripe for Hell
>
> (*ibid.*, XIII)

and with his repeated question,

> Can the Aethiop wash him fair ?
>
> (Occasional Hymns, III)

Toplady was in everything an extremist, believing himself foul in his sin, yet confident in his salvation, struggling and tempted yet ardent in aspiration, beset by present troubles but looking ever forward to his future bliss. There is no quietness in Toplady, little room even for a pause to praise, but there is plenty of self-examination, plenty of prayer, plenty of conviction. Yet there is nothing forced or artificial about him. Toplady's was not a hot-house faith ; it was rather faith in the furnace, religion at perpetual white heat.

The Place and Purpose of the Sacraments[1]

By The Editor

A SACRAMENT is defined in the Catechism of the Church of England as "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof". In brief, it is a sign, a means, and a pledge.

* * * * *

A sacrament is a *sign*: that is, it is not intended as a mere empty ceremony or frivolous spectacle, for a sign is necessarily *significant*. Thus the outward symbols of the Christian sacraments point meaningfully beyond themselves to a deep spiritual reality. This in turn requires that there should be a certain similitude, a symbolical appropriateness, of the sign to the reality which it signifies—but not an identity, else it would not be a sign, but the reality itself. Accordingly Augustine declares that "if sacraments had not some point of real resemblance to the things of which they are the sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all";[2] Archbishop Whitgift speaks of "the similitude which sacraments have with the things whereof they be sacraments";[3] and Richard Hooker observes that "the inward grace of sacraments may teach what serveth best for their outward form".[4] "When in baptism our bodies are washed with water, we are taught that our souls are washed in the blood of Christ," explains Bishop Jewel. "The outward washing or sprinkling represents the sprinkling and washing which is wrought within us: the water signifies the blood of Christ."[5]

The significance of the sign resides, however, not only in its symbolical appropriateness, but even more so in the words or doctrine with which its institution is associated. Thus Augustine (so frequently quoted by our Reformers) writes: "The word is added to the element and there results the sacrament, as if itself also a kind of *visible* word";[6] and, on another occasion: "Material symbols are nothing else than visible speech."[7] As William Tyndale remarks, "the sacrament doth much more vehemently print lively the faith, and make it sink down in the heart, than do bare words only: as a man is more sure of that he heareth, seeth, feeleth, smelleth, and tasteth, than that he heareth only".[8]

This word which, audible in preaching, becomes visible in the sacrament, is essentially the word of the Gospel. It is the word of Christ, or about Christ, who Himself is the Incarnate Word of God. The authority of a Christian sacrament is the authority of Christ Himself, who by adding His word to the element, transformed it into a sacrament. "It was of necessity," says Hooker, "that the words of express declaration taken from the very mouth of our Lord Himself should be added unto visible elements, that the one might infallibly teach what the other do most assuredly bring to pass."[9] Therefore

those only are properly Christian sacraments which are sacraments *of the Gospel*, instituted by Christ Himself, or, as Article XXV puts it, " ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel ".[10]

The number of the sacraments is by this definition limited to two, namely, Baptism and the Holy Communion, and this delimitation is in harmony with the mind of the Church since the earliest centuries. Of course, by broadening the definition it is possible to increase the number of the sacraments, even to the extent of viewing the entire universe as full of sacramental significance. The number of seven sacraments on which the Roman Church now insists can claim no greater antiquity than the twelfth century and, notwithstanding the fulminations of the Council of Trent,[11] has rightly been rejected by the Protestant Churches. The comment of Bishop Andrewes is to the point : " For more than a thousand years the number of seven sacraments was never heard of. How, then, can the belief in seven sacraments be catholic, which means, always believed ? "[12] " We acknowledge there be two sacraments," writes Bishop Jewel, " which, we judge, properly ought to be called by this name ; that is to say, baptism and the sacrament of thanksgiving. For thus many we see were delivered and sanctified by Christ, and well allowed of the old fathers."[13] And in his *Treatise of the Sacraments*, after quoting from Ambrose and Augustine, he says : " Thus Augustine and Ambrose, unto whom I might also join other ancient fathers, reckon but two sacraments. Let no man then be offended with us for so doing : we do no new thing, but restore the ordinance of Christ, and keep the example of the holy fathers." Baptism and the Lord's Supper are " properly and truly called the sacraments of the church, because in them the element is joined to the word, and they take their ordinance of Christ, and be visible signs of invisible grace ".[14]

* * * * *

A Christian sacrament is also *a means*. In other words, the sacraments of the Gospel, in their capacity as signs, are not *bare* signs. They are " *effectual* signs of grace and God's good will towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us ".[15] But their efficacy is not automatic (*ex opere operato*) ; for the external sign by itself is impotent to produce any spiritual effect. Water cannot cleanse, nor bread and wine nourish, the soul. The efficacy of a sacrament is indissolubly linked to the word of promise of which it is the sign—not, however, to the word as a mere pronouncement of a formula of consecration, but to the word as a proclamation of the Gospel to those who receive the sacrament. That is to say, the sacraments, to be effective, must be addressed, word-wise to men and women as to intelligent, responsible, and needy persons of whom it is required that they should inwardly believe the word thus proclaimed to them. " Whence," demands Augustine, " has water so great an efficacy, as in touching the body to cleanse the soul, save by the operation of the word ; and that *not because it is uttered, but because it is believed* ? "[16] Again, referring to our Lord's words concerning " the meat which endures unto eternal life ", he says : " To what purpose do you make ready teeth and stomach? Believe, and you have eaten already."[17] And, again, he explains that

to eat of the bread that comes down from heaven (John vi. 50) " belongs to the virtue of the sacrament, not to the visible sacrament : he that eats within, not without ; who eats in his heart, not who presses with his teeth ".[18] " We affirm," says Bishop Jewel, " that Christ doth truly and presently give His own self in His sacraments ; in baptism, that we may put Him on ; and in His supper that we may eat Him by faith and spirit, and may have everlasting life by His cross and blood. . . . For, although we do not touch the body of Christ with teeth and mouth, yet we hold Him fast, and eat Him by faith, by understanding, and by the spirit."[19] The sacraments, therefore, " are not bare signs : it were blasphemy so to say. The grace of God doth always work with His sacraments; but we are taught not to seek that grace in the sign, but to assure ourselves, by receiving the sign, that it is given by the thing signified ".[20]

The effect of the sacraments, therefore, cannot be dissociated from the manner in which they are received. They are means of divine grace only to the heart which gratefully believes the promises of which they are the signs. " In such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation," declares Article XXV ; and the words of invitation in the Communion service of our Book of Common Prayer remind us that it is those who draw near *with faith* who receive the holy symbols to their comfort. Thus Archbishop Cranmer writes that, " although the sacramental tokens be only significations and figures, yet doth Almighty God effectually work, in them that duly receive His sacraments, those divine and celestial operations which He hath promised, and by the sacraments be signified ".[21] Hooker also is quite emphatic concerning the manner of their efficacy as a means of grace when he says that the benefit received through them is received " from God Himself, the Author of the sacraments, and not from any other natural or supernatural quality in them ", and that " they contain *in themselves* no vital force or efficacy, they are not physical but *moral instruments* of salvation, duties of service and worship, which unless we perform as the Author of grace requireth, they are unprofitable. For," he adds, " all receive not the grace of God which receive the sacraments of His grace."[22]

* * * * *

It is necessary to affirm, moreover, that the Christian sacraments are not without effect even when received unworthily ; but in that case it is the opposite effect which they mediate : they then become, not means of grace, but means of judgment. Hence the assertion of Article XXV that " they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as Saint Paul saith " (an allusion to I Cor. xi. 29) ; and similarly Article XXIX says of the Holy Communion that " the wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint Augustine saith) the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ ; but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing ". Hypocritically to associate oneself with those who partake of these eloquent symbols of the Gospel is to show a contempt for the Gospel and its promises far

worse than that displayed by those who hold themselves aloof from the worship of the Church.

It must not be imagined, however, that the grace of God is in any way created by the faith of man. God's grace is God's initiative on behalf of man who is helpless because of sin. Divine grace precedes all. Faith is man's response of gratitude and appropriation to the grace that is freely offered. It embraces, with humility and wonder, the saving promises of the Gospel. Human unbelief cannot nullify the reality of the work of Christ. The word of God, which is visible in the sacraments, is prior both to those sacraments and to that faith of which their participation is an expression, and, equally, God's word remains true, however much man may spurn it.

Hence it has become customary to speak of a sacrament not only as a sign and a means of grace, but also as a *pledge* of God's faithfulness, or as a *seal* which is as it were affixed to His word. A seal attached to a document adds nothing to the text of the document. It is simply a visible assurance of the authenticity of that document which apart from the seal is none the less authentic. Sacraments are seals added to the word of the Gospel which visibly confirm the authenticity of that word, without, however, adding anything to the word itself. And as a seal by itself, or affixed to a wordless sheet of paper, is void of all value and significance, so too the sacraments, if divorced from the word of God, degenerate into empty superstitions. " Christ hath ordained them," writes Jewel, " that by them He might set before our eyes the mysteries of our salvation, and might more strongly confirm the faith which we have in His blood, and might seal His grace in our hearts. As princes' seals confirm and warrant their deeds and charters, so do the sacraments witness unto our conscience that God's promises are true, and shall continue for ever. Thus doth God make known His secret purpose to His Church : first He declareth His mercy by His word ; then He sealeth it and assureth it by His sacraments. In the word we have His promises : in the sacraments we see them."[23]

Thomas Becon propounds seven reasons for the institution of the sacraments :

" First, that they should be unto us testimonies, pledges, signs, or seals of God's grace, favour, and mercy, to teach us that God is merciful unto us, and will forgive us our sins, justify and save us for Christ's sake, and that all the benefits of Christ both belong and are freely given unto us of God the Father, if with faith we come and receive those holy mysteries. . . .

" Secondly, that they should be certain tokens and marks, whereby the Church of Christ may be discerned from the synagogue of antichrist. . . .

" Thirdly, that they should be signs, tokens, and marks of our confession, in the which we outwardly profess what we inwardly think and believe. . . .

" Fourthly, that they should be as sinews and bonds to link and knit together the congregation of God publicly and openly, whereby they may be known to be of one company, and of one spirit, of one faith, and of one doctrine and profession. . . .

" Fifthly, that they should be unto us memorials, to put us in remembrance what mutual benevolence, what love, and hearty friendship one to another ought to reign among us. For seeing we all are partakers of the same mysteries, baptized with one baptism, and eat together of one bread, and drink together of one cup, by this means protesting openly that we are members one of another's body, whereof Christ Jesus is the Head ; who seeth not how far all enmity, debate, strife, malice, envy, and all displeasure ought to be from us? . . .

" Sixthly, that they should be testimonials unto us, to testify and witness how nigh Christ joins Himself unto us, that He giveth Himself whole unto us, and that He will dwell in us, and endow us with all His benefits and riches, so that whatsoever is Christ's, the same is ours. . . .

" Seventhly, that they should be unto us a singular consolation and an exceeding great comfort in all our troubles, perils, dangers, and adversities, while in receiving them we behold and consider the merciful good will of God toward us, with this persuasion, that that God, who hath instituted these sacraments, delivered them unto us as pledges of His most hearty good will toward us, and hath also commanded us to use them for our comfort, will not leave us succourless, but in His time will deliver us from all those miseries, and bring us into the haven of quietness. . . ."[24]

* * * * *

Baptism and Holy Communion as sacraments of the New Testament answer to circumcision and the passover as sacraments of the Old Testament. " God," says Hooker of the former, " hath annexed them for ever unto the New Testament, as other rites were before with the Old."[25] The passover is explained by Tyndale as " a very prophecy of the passion of Christ, describing the very manner and passion of His death, and the effect and virtue thereof also ; in whose stead is the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ come, as baptism in the room or stead of circumcision ".[26] But although with the coming of Christ the outward and visible signs were changed, yet there is no essential discontinuity ; for the grace of God is the same in both Testaments and Christ is the one Mediator and Redeemer throughout the entire duration of human history.[27] The sacraments of the Old Testament, affirms Augustine, " were types of Christ who was to come, and when Christ fulfilled them by His advent they were done away, and were done away because they were fulfilled ".[28]

Roger Hutchinson speaks of the abiding relevance of both old and new covenants (or testaments) in the following manner : " In the time of the old testament, before Christ's incarnation, such as in all their ceremonies had an eye to the Seed promised, and believed in Christ to come, were of the new testament, under grace, and Christians. . . . And such, again as at these days do not believe, but live after the flesh, are yet under the old testament, under the law, under the stroke of the axe, which is put to the root of all evil trees. For both testaments were effectual from the beginning of the world ; the one in virtuous and godly men, the other upon the unvirtuous and ungodly."[29] And, referring more specifically to the sacraments, Cranmer asserts that the Old Testament " fathers and prophets did eat Christ's body and drink

His blood in promise of redemption to be wrought, and we eat and drink the same flesh and blood in confirmation of our faith in the redemption already wrought";[30] and, again: "It was all but one Christ to them and us. . . . He was in their sacraments spiritually and effectually present."[31]

The continuity of the New Testament with the Old in this respect is brought out over and over again in the teaching of Christ and His apostles. Christ is "our passover" Who has been sacrificed for us (I Cor. v. 7); He is "the Lamb of God Who takes away the sin of the world" (John i. 29); it is "precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ", with which we have been redeemed (1 Peter i. 19). Accordingly, the proper preface for Easter Day in the Communion Service of the Book of Common Prayer speaks of our Lord as "the very Paschal Lamb which was offered for us, and hath taken away the sin of the world". Baptism, indeed, is expounded by St. Paul as a spiritual circumcision: in Christ, he tells the Colossian Christians, "ye were also circumcized with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ; having been buried with Him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with Him through faith in the working of God, who raised Him from the dead"—and this has taken place despite "the uncircumcision of their flesh", for he is speaking in particular to Gentile converts (Col. ii. 11-13). So, too, with the Jew under the Old Testament the outward and visible sign was of no profit to him apart from a heart of faith and obedience: "He is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, not in the letter; whose praise is not of man, but of God" (Rom. ii. 28f.; cf. Acts vii. 51; Lev. xxvi. 41; Jer. vi. 10; ix. 26; Ezek. xliv. 7, 9). The true children of Abraham, with whom God established His covenant of grace together with its sacrament of circumcision, are not those that can boast a fleshly descent, but "they which be of faith": all who are Christ's are "Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise" (Gal. iii. 7, 29; cf. John viii. 39ff., 56ff.).

The advent of Christ is the clinching and consummating proof that God has remembered "His holy covenant, the oath which He sware unto Abraham our father" (Luke i. 72f.). St. Paul even speaks of Christ as having been "made a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, that He might confirm the promises given unto the fathers"—promises which extend God's redeeming grace to all the nations of the earth (Rom. xv. 8ff.; cf. Gal. iii. 8f.), and which are sealed no longer with circumcision, but with baptism. The significance of baptism, therefore, is not different from that of circumcision. Both are affixed to God's eternal covenant. Both symbolize obedience to God's will, death to sin, the putting off of the body of the flesh (cf. Rom. vi. 3f; Col. ii. 11). Baptism, no less than circumcision, is a sign and seal of the righteousness of faith (Rom. iv. 11), the righteousness, that is, which is reckoned to all who obediently believe and appropriate to themselves the promised grace of God (Rom. iv. 16-25). In all this there is an entire consistency between Old and New Testa-

ments, which is only to be expected, since there is but one covenant, established by God in the former, whose promises are fulfilled and eternally confirmed in the latter. The new covenant is distinct from the old, not in its content, but in the fact that the law of God, formerly engraved externally on tables of stone, is now inwardly inscribed by the finger of God in the willing hearts of His people (Jer. xxxi. 31ff. ; Ezek. xi. 19ff. ; II Cor. iii. 3ff.).

* * * * *

If it should be asked why, seeing there has been only one covenant of grace, circumcision was discarded, it must be answered that the appropriateness of this sacramental symbol ceased with the coming of Christ and the completion of His redeeming work. Baptism is the symbol of the new age which Christ's coming has inaugurated, and was for this reason administered by His forerunner, John the Baptist, as an anticipatory rite of repentance in preparation for the approaching kingdom. Since God's covenant promise was that in Abraham's *seed* all the nations of the earth would be blessed (Gen. xxii. 18), and since a *male* deliverer was looked for according to God's word (Deut. xviii. 18 ; Ps. cx. 4 ; Is. vii. 14 ; ix. 6), the sign of circumcision was appropriate in that it was administered to all males within the covenant and involved the male generative organ. But when the promised seed, even Christ, in whom all God's purposes of grace are concentrated, had come, this particular symbolism ceased to have a place. In Him there is now neither male nor female, and accordingly a sacrament which may be administered to both is now instituted through His command (Gal. iii. 16, 26-29).

Again, circumcision was a rite which involved the shedding of blood and which in this respect pointed forward to that perfect and final blood-shedding whereby " the putting off of the body of the flesh " would be achieved for all God's people. But now that Christ's blood, which cleanses from *all* sin (I John i. 7), has been shed, there can be no more shedding of blood : His is " the blood of an eternal covenant " (Heb. xiii. 20 ; x. 10ff.). And so in this respect also circumcision has ceased to be appropriate as a sacrament of the Gospel. It was superseded, and rightly so, when those realities which, in sign, it anticipated were fulfilled in Christ.

Similarly, the sacrament of the passover, which was in symbol both a commemoration of the deliverance by God's hand from the bondage of Egypt and also an anticipation of the coming of that Lamb of God, without blemish and without spot, who would finally deliver mankind from bondage to sin, was discontinued because the appropriateness of its symbolism was concluded with the fulfilment of what it portended. After Christ had made, " by His one oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world,"[32] there was no further place for a sacrament involving sacrifice, blood-shedding, and death. There is place, however, for a sacrament whose elements are fitting symbols of Christ's finished work. Hence the institution by our Lord of the Holy Communion, in which the bread broken bespeaks His body crucified and the wine outpoured His blood shed for us at Calvary.

The symbolism of baptism is set forth in Rom. vi. 3ff. and Col. ii. 12. It is that of death, burial, and resurrection, by identification of ourselves with Christ in His death and burial, implying the crucifixion with Him of the old nature and the doing away of the body of sin, and identification with Christ in His resurrection from the dead, implying the newness of life in which the Christian is to walk. Our baptism witnesses to us that we should reckon ourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus (Rom. vi. 11)—or, as the Baptismal Service of the Book of Common Prayer puts it, " Baptism doth represent unto us our profession, which is, to follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and to be made like unto Him ; that, as He died and rose again for us, so should we, who are baptized, die from sin, and rise again unto righteousness ; continually mortifying all our evil and corrupt affections and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living."

But the symbolism of baptism is further, and even more obviously, that of cleansing or washing ; for water, which is the element used for this purpose in daily life, is in baptism the outward and visible sign of the inward " washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit " (Tit. iii. 5). Christ cleanses His Church " by the washing of water with the word (Eph. v. 26—ἐν ῥήματι, in the sphere of the word ", that is, not by bare outward ceremonial, but by the grace spoken to believing hearts, of which the sacrament is significant). Thus in the English Baptismal Service prayer is offered that the one to be baptized may be washed and sanctified with the Holy Spirit.

The sacrament of baptism, then, is a visible word which speaks of cleansing from defilement, death to sin, and resurrection to new life in Christ. It is, in short, the sacrament of regeneration. Jewel draws attention to its inner reality when he describes it as " our regeneration or new birth, whereby we are born anew in Christ, and are made the sons of God and heirs of the kingdom of heaven ", and as " the sacrament of the remission of sins and of that washing which we have in the blood of Christ ".[33] But he is careful to give this warning : " Not the water, but the blood of Christ, reconcileth us unto God, strengtheneth our conscience, and worketh our redemption. We must seek salvation in Christ alone, and not in any outward thing."[34] And Becon stresses that the baptism of the Holy Spirit is so necessary " that without it the baptism of water profiteth nothing ".[35] To the same purpose is the assertion of the Catechism of the Church of England that " repentance, whereby they forsake sin, and faith, whereby they stedfastly believe the promises of God made to them in that sacrament ", are required of those that receive baptism. " Our baptism," says Bishop Latimer, " is not only ordained for that cause, to know a Christian from a Turk or heathen, but it hath a further signification : it signifieth that we must wash away the old Adam, forsake and set aside all carnal lusts and desires, and put on Christ ; receive Him with a pure heart, and study to live and go forward in all goodness, according unto His will and commandment."[36]

* * * * *

In view of these considerations, the question arises as to the permissibility of the practice of infant baptism. On what scriptural

grounds, if any, may this sacrament be administered to little children who as yet are incapable of the response of repentance, faith, and obedience? The answer to this query must be sought in the attitude of God to children as revealed in the Scriptures; and this is not difficult to discover. While it is true that God's covenant was established, in the first place, with a responsible adult, Abraham, consequent upon his faith, and that circumcision, which was the "seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while he was in uncircumcision" (Rom. iv. 11), was instituted as the sacrament, or visible word, of this covenant; yet it is an indisputable fact that from the very beginning infant children had a secure place within the covenant, and that, for this reason, the sacrament of circumcision was administered to them, even though at the time of receiving this "seal of the righteousness of faith" they were incapable of the response of faith to the promises of the covenant. Indeed, the circumcision of infant boys who were born within the covenant was by no means merely optional or permissible; it was strictly *commanded* by God, with the warning that to disobey this command was at the same time to break His covenant (Gen. xvii. 10-14).

In the New Testament, as we have seen, the covenant is the same, though the sacramental sign is changed. But there is no indication whatever that God's attitude to children has changed. On the contrary, His perfect consistency in this as in all other matters is fully displayed. Our Divine Redeemer Himself took little children (παιδία) up in His arms and gave them His blessing, admonishing His disciples, who wished to keep them from Him, that these little ones should be permitted to come to Him, "for to such belongs the kingdom of God" (Mark x. 13-16). Who will be so rash as to suppose that Christ's blessing of these babes was a meaningless act and that His words associating them with the kingdom of God were empty of truth? And yet there are many professing Christians to-day who, by withholding the sacrament of baptism from their infant children, behave as though the children of believers no longer have any legitimate position within God's covenant of grace. By acting in this way they "leave the seed of believers, whilst in their infant state, in the same condition with those of pagans and infidels, expressly contrary to God's covenant".[37] They are also, it seems, impelled by an unscriptural individualism which fails to take into account the solidarity of the family as a communal entity within the scheme of God's creation. Little children cannot be viewed in isolation from their parents. They are not born in isolation, but within the family group; and not only within the family group, but also, if their parents profess the Christian faith, within the wider community of Christ's Church, that is to say, within the sphere of God's covenant, in which case the sacrament of that covenant should be administered to them.

St. Paul, indeed, affirms that in a home where only one of the parents is a believer the children are none the less holy, notwithstanding the unbelief of the other parent (I Cor. vii. 14). The only satisfactory understanding of this verse is that the Christian faith of even one parent is sufficient to ensure that the children of that home are regarded by God as being within the sphere of His holy covenant.

If this is so, then it is proper that they should receive baptism, whereby the seal of that covenant is placed upon them. This accords well with, for instance, the baptism of the whole household of the Philippian gaoler, subsequent to his conversion (Acts xvi. 30-34). The faith of the head of a family brings, together with himself, all those for whom he is parentally responsible into a new relationship, a relationship before God of privilege and answerability. The " household " baptisms of the New Testament correspond too closely to the " household " circumcisions of the Old Testament for the contention to carry conviction that little children could not have been included among the members of households who were baptized.

Had it been intended that little children should not receive baptism, as being no longer within the scope of God's covenant, a precise command to this effect would have been necessary, for it would have involved a startlingly revolutionary concept of the place of children within the purposes of God. But the very fact that there is no such command in the New Testament presupposes that they continued to be fit recipients of the covenantal sign, and did in fact receive it. And this conclusion harmonizes with the significant fact that no instance is to be found in the New Testament of the baptism of adults or adolescents who had grown up in Christian homes. Scriptural reality demands that the children of believers should not be treated as though they were outside the scope of the purposes and promises of God, and the radical inadequacy of the position taken up by the opponents of infant baptism is betrayed by the fact that, unable genuinely to regard their babes as existing in a spiritual vacuum, they feel it necessary to resort to a practice of infant " dedication ", even though it is nowhere enjoined in the New Testament. Is not this an acknowledgment that the grace of God is sovereign over their children and, in fact, that their little ones belong within His covenant ? Would it not, then, be more consistent to grant them the sacrament of that covenant ?

* * * * *

Those who maintain that only believers should be baptized, or, in other words, that faith must always precede baptism, are taking their stand on perilous ground, not only because they must then be asked to account for the clear scriptural instances of babes who from birth were recipients of God's special grace, such as Jeremiah, whom God sanctified from the womb (Jer. i. 5), and John the Baptist, who was filled with the Holy Spirit even from his mother's womb (Luke i. 15) ; but even more so because the logic of their position demands that faith must always precede salvation, or, in other words, that only believers can be saved. Faith, they argue, must precede baptism : infants are incapable of faith : therefore infants cannot be baptized. But, this being so, they should be prepared to affirm, with equal rigour, the parallel syllogism : faith must precede salvation : infants are incapable of faith : therefore infants cannot be saved. This, in turn, can only mean that those dying before they reach years of responsibility are eternally lost. But who would dare to insist on this logic when he has the scriptural teaching concerning God's attitude to little children before his eyes and our Lord's words, " of such is the

kingdom of heaven," sounding in his ears? The preaching of the Gospel is, of course, addressed to those who are of such an age as to be capable of grasping and responding to its demands. But the very concept of faith as response necessarily implies the priority and supremacy of the grace to which it responds. Grace is sovereign action; it is neither posterior nor subordinate to faith; and the baptism of the new-born children of believing parents emphasizes the priority and supremacy of grace.

Christian parents, therefore, do not despair of the salvation of children who die either before they have been baptized or before they have attained to years of responsibility. With Bishop Jewel we should confidently assert: "Our children are the children of God. He is our God, and the God of our seed. They be under the covenant with us."[38] Like faith, baptism, whether of infants or adults, is preceded by grace, of which it is the sign and pointer. Grace alone is sovereign, and is dependent neither on an external ceremony nor on a human response. "If our election, vocation, creation, reparation, justification, glorification, and whatsoever maketh unto the salvation either of body or soul, come of the free grace and mere mercy of God, is it not injurious to the grace and kindness of the Lord our God so to embrace it, that without the help of an external sign and outward ceremony it cannot save us?" asks Thomas Becon. "Hath God so bound and made Himself thrall to a sacrament, that without it His power of saving is lame and of no force to defend from damnation?"[39] The matter is well summed up by Hooker when he writes: "The fruit of baptism dependeth only upon the covenant which God hath made. . . . God by covenant requireth in the elder sort faith and baptism, in children the sacrament of baptism alone, whereunto He hath also given them right by special privilege of birth within the bosom of the holy Church."[40]

A child, when he has grown to years of responsibility, may indeed repudiate the grace of which the sacrament administered to him in infancy is a symbol and pledge. Neither in Scripture nor in experience is there such a thing as automatic (*ex opere operato*) sacramental regeneration. In the pre-Christian age great numbers of Jews who, in accordance with God's command, had received the outward seal of circumcision, showed themselves, by the rebellion of unbelief, to be altogether uncircumcized in heart. In a word, they possessed the sign, but not the reality to which it pointed. "Circumcision without faith was as a seal cut off from a deed of gift," says Nathaniel Dimock. "But it was unbelief which cut it off. The privilege and responsibility of circumcision was this, that it was a call to, and required, faith in the promises it sealed. When those promises were believed, circumcision became circumcision of the heart."[41] And this is equally true of baptism. That the want of the sacrament does not exclude from salvation is shown by our Lord's promise to the penitent thief, who died without being baptized. On the other hand, that participation in the sacrament does not guarantee salvation is shown by the example of Simon Magus, who received it unworthily and to his condemnation. In the rite of Confirmation an opportunity is afforded to those who have been baptized in childhood and who have come to years of dis-

cretion, so that (in the words of the English Prayer Book) " they may themselves, with their own mouth and consent, openly before the Church, ratify and confirm " the promises of their baptism. That very many of those who are baptized neglect to come to confirmation, and go on to lead ungodly lives and wilfully keep themselves separate from the fellowship of Christ's Church is a patent fact which the theology of sacramentalism cannot ignore.[42]

But this by no means implies that baptism is a vain formality, even in the case of those who choose to repudiate the reality to which it points. As I have said earlier, the sacraments are always effective as means, either of grace to those who receive them rightly, which is the main purpose of their institution, or of condemnation to those who abuse them. For every believer, his baptism, though an event of the past, should constantly be before him as an ever-present witness to the grace and truth of which it is eloquent. Circumcision, says Latimer, " was a certain, sure, infallible, and effectual token of God's good-will towards them to whom it was given : for as many as did believe the covenant of God, it did ascertain them of the good-will of God towards them, that they should be delivered out of all their troubles and adversities, and that they should be sure of the help of God. . . . So let us ever consider, in what trouble and calamity soever we be, let us remember that we be baptized ; that God hath promised to help us, to deliver us from all our sins and wickedness, to be our God."[43]

As for those who treat their baptism in an irresponsible or superstitious manner, we can hardly do better than hear the voice of Bishop Latimer once again : " I heard of late," he says, " that there be some wicked persons, despisers of God and His benefits, who say, ' It is no matter whatsoever we do ; we be baptized : we cannot be damned ; for all those that be baptized and be called Christians shall be saved.' This is a false and wicked opinion ; and I assure you that such which bear the name of Christians and be baptized, but follow not God's commandments, that such fellows, I say, be worse than the Turks and heathen : for the Turks and heathen have made no promise unto Christ to serve Him. These fellows have made promise in baptism to keep Christ's rule, which thing they do not ; and therefore they be worse than the Turks : for they break their promise made before God and the whole congregation."[44]

(To be continued)

REFERENCES:

[1] In this article I have given particular, though not exclusive, attention to the writings of the English divines of the sixteenth century.

[2] Augustine of Hippo, 354-430 : Epistle XCVIII, to Boniface.

[3] John Whitgift, 1530-1604, Archbishop of Canterbury : Tract. XXI, in *Works* (Parker Society), vol. III, p. 383.

[4] Richard Hooker, 1554-1600 : *Ecclesiastical Polity*, V, lviii, 1.

[5] John Jewel, 1522-1571, Bishop of Salisbury : *A Treatise of the Sacraments*, in *Works* (Parker Society), Vol. II, p. 1101.

[6] Augustine : Tract. LXXX, 3, on the Gospel of John.

[7] Augustine : *Con. Faust.*, XIX, 16.

[8] William Tyndale, 1494-1536, translator of the Bible and Reformation martyr : *A Brief Declaration of the Sacraments*, in *Doctrinal Treatises* (Parker Society), p. 360.

[9] Hooker : *Loc. cit.*

[10] Cf. also Article XIX which speaks of the sacraments being " duly administered according to Christ's ordinance " as a mark of the visible Church of Christ.

[11] " If anyone shall say that the sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, or that they are more or less than seven, . . . let him be anathema " : Session VII, Canon 1.

[12] Lancelot Andrewes, 1555-1626, Bishop of Winchester ; quoted by W. H. Griffith Thomas, *Principles of Theology* (London, 1930), p. 354.

[13] Jewel : *Apology of the Church of England*, in *Works* (Parker Society), Vol. III, p. 62.

[14] Jewel : *A Treatise of the Sacraments*, p. 1103.

[15] Article XXV.

[16] Augustine : Tract. LXXX, 3, on the Gospel of John.

[17] Augustine : *ibid.*, Tract. XXV, 12.

[18] Augustine : *ibid.*, Tract. XXVI, 12.

[19] Jewel : *Apology*, p. 64.

[20] Jewel : *A Treatise of the Sacraments*, p. 1102.

[21] Thomas Cranmer, 1489-1556, Archbishop of Canterbury and Reformation martyr : *On the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, in *Works* (Parker Society), Vol. I, p. 148.

[22] Hooker : *Op. cit.*, V, lvii, 4.

[23] Jewel : *A Treatise of the Sacraments*, p. 1099.

[24] Thomas Becon, 1513-1567 : *Catechism*, in *Works* (Parker Society), Vol. II, pp. 199ff.

[25] Hooker : *Op. cit.*, V, lvii, 2.

[26] Tyndale : *Op. cit.*, p. 354.

[27] Cf. Article VII : " The Old Testament is not contrary to the New: for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and Man."

[28] Augustine : *Con. Faust.*, XIX, 13.

[29] Roger Hutchinson, d. 1555 : *Works* (Parker Society), pp. 326 f.

[30] Cranmer : *Op. cit.*, p. 75.

[31] Cranmer : *ibid.*, p. 60.

[32] Quoted from the prayer of consecration in the Communion Service.

[33] Jewel : *A Treatise of the Sacraments*, p. 1104.

[34] Jewel : *Ibid.*, p. 1106.

[35] Becon : *Op. cit.*, p. 203.

[36] Hugh Latimer, 1485-1555, Bishop of Worcester and Reformation martyr : *Sermons and Remains*, in *Works* (Parker Society), Vol. II, p. 133.

[37] John Owen, 1616-1683, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford : *Works*, Vol. XVI, p. 259 (London, 1853).

[38] Jewel : *A Treatise of the Sacraments*, p. 1107.

[39] Becon : *Op. cit.*, p. 215.

[40] Hooker : *Op. cit.*, V, lxii, 15.

[41] Nathaniel Dimock : *The Doctrine of the Sacraments*, p. 48 (London, 1908).

[42] Cf., for example, the admission of the Anglo-Catholic author, E. L. Mascell, that " the reception of baptism is in itself no guarantee of final perseverance and ultimate salvation " : *Christ, the Christian, and the Church*, p. 84 (second impression ; London, 1955).

[43] Latimer : *Op. cit.*, pp. 133f.

[44] Latimer : *Sermons*, in *Works* (Parker Society), Vol. I, p. 346.

Book Reviews

Reviewers in this Issue

The Rev. H. J. Burgess, M.A., Ph.D. The Rev. G. G. Dawson, D.D. The Rev. Canon T. G. Mohan, M.A., The Rev. J. A. Motyer, M.A., B.D., The Rev. J. R. W. Stott, M.A. The Rev. J. B. Taylor, M.A.

THE STUDY OF OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY TO-DAY. *By E. J. Young.* (*James Clarke.*) 112 *pp.* 10/6.

Professor Young, of Westminster Theological Seminary, delivered the four lectures contained in this book to mark the dedication of the new buildings of the London Bible College in May, 1958. In the first lecture, Old Testament Theology and History—easily the most important lecture of the four—the author seeks to lay as his foundation that the only valid approach to the Old Testament is to come with Christian theistic presuppositions. Only thus can there be a theology of the Old Testament, for unless we are able to say that " Old Testament Theology is the study of God in His self-revelation in the Old Testament " (p. 28) there is no option but to relegate the Old Testament to the level of ancient but entirely human opinions about God as revealed in certain actions which the ancients supposed Him to have performed. Dr. Young takes pains to show—and succeeds in showing—that modern views of the Old Testament which may be summarized by the words " Heilsgeschichte " (Von Rad) and " Biblical Theology and Recital " (G. E. Wright) are simply attempts to evade the Old Testament's own claim to be a record of history to which is annexed a revelation of God in words, and that if these views are followed we have no grounds for giving more credence to the statement that Yahweh brought Israel out of Egypt than we have for accepting the opinion of Hattusilis that Ishtar gave him his kingly power.

The second lecture, The Nature of Old Testament Theology, urges the progressive nature of Old Testament and of Biblical revelation. Revelation has taken place in " epochs "—" a particular period in the history of Israel which sustained a unique relation to the plan of God in redemption " (pp. 38f.). This revelation has been entirely controlled by God and the Old Testament is not a record of what man thought about God but of what God showed man of Himself, as He saw fit. This revelation, which passages like Hebrews 1: 1f. teach us to see as continuing into the New Testament to find the completion of the progression, is self-contained. That is to say, while it came to the men concerned in thought forms which as men of their time they could appreciate—that is, the Old Testament may validly be studied and in part can only be understood by means of its own " cultural milieu "—yet " in the interpretation of Genesis we shall be far more greatly benefited by a study of what Paul had to say in Romans 5, for example, than by a minute comparison of Genesis with Enuma Elish " (p. 42).

The third Lecture, The Content of Old Testament Theology, deals

with the Covenant. It is here that the treatment of the topic is unlikely to commend itself to those who are opposed to the view of Scripture espoused by the Lecturer, for it is unlikely that they will do more than dismiss his treatment of Genesis 2 and 3 without attempting to assess the very significant and telling argumentation on which his exposition rests. In a word, he sets out from the point of view that the later and better known covenants—e.g., Sinai—are but particular manifestations of that dispensation of grace wherein God has ever approached man. The notion of a covenant therefore appears even where the actual title is not used. He proceeds then to expound the Paradise and fall Stories in illustration of the Biblical Covenant, showing on the one hand how in this way the whole story of Redemption and the doctrines of Man, Sin and Grace, are entirely consistent, and on the other showing that the Bible seriously demands that these early chapters of Genesis be treated as historical. It will be all too easy for some to sneer at the thought of Twentieth Century Man accepting the talking snake ; let them first be sure that their exposition of the matter takes account of the differentia of Genesis so clearly stated by Dr. Young.

The final lecture rounds off the series by showing the theological unity of the Old and New Testaments, thus offering a positive defence of the position adopted throughout, that Old Testament theology is only possible on the basis of Christian theistic presuppositions.

The lectures are marked throughout by a robust conservative scholarship. The author—rightly, in view of his eminence and qualifications—felt at liberty to lay about him, and to expose the error of many popular and facile views of the Old Testament. However, he is never interested in polemic for its own sake, and never does his criticism or his frontal assault transgress the bounds of either charity or courtesy. The lectures are exceedingly readable, and—as the reviewer has discovered—repay a second reading. Nevertheless, worthwhile though the book is, one hundred and twelve small pages for ten shillings and sixpence is bad value, and the worth of the content does not really remove the sense of being " stung " which the exterior of the book provokes.

J. A. Motyer.

THE ACTS OF GOD. A Study of the Basis of Typology in the Old Testament.
By Francis Foulkes. (*Tyndale Press.*) 1/6.

The substance of this book, which was the Tyndale Old Testament Lecture for 1955, may be stated in three quotations : " History is instruction in the ways of God " (p. 20) ; " History is recorded because history may be repeated " (p. 21) ; " They (i.e., ancient Israel) thought of the future in terms of the greatest leaders that God had previously given them, and the greatest acts of God on behalf of Israel " (p. 24). What God did in the past He did on the basis of unchanging principles of righteousness and unchanging purposes of righteousness ; therefore there is a unity of principle between what is past and what is future. Prophets, understanding the factors which determined God's past action, can predict His future action—saving only that constantly it is asserted that what is to come will outstrip

in glory and effectiveness anything that has gone before. Such, in summary, is the content of the first two chapters of the book, and, apart from seeing the matter developed by reference to individual examples, such as David among the Persons, and the Exodus among the Events, the reader of this review is as well informed as the reader of the book. We are told what we know.

However, when in the last chapter the writer turns to expound for us what we might not know so well, it cannot be said that he succeeds to anything like the same extent. The greatest service which he might have rendered was to say what sort of typology is illegitimate. It is clear that he thinks some is, and that it ought to be called by the name allegory, but we are left very unilluminated as to what this is. One can do no more than say what the book says : if typology loses its grip on history, and treats words as mere symbols, that is allegory and is largely a matter of personal whim. Undoubtedly the competent, even if not very exciting, survey of the typological character of Old Testament history with which the book opens ought to have led to more definite exposition of typological principles and practice than the last seven pages give us. Anyone who is unconvinced of the unity of the Old Testament, theologically, or of the unity of the Old and New Testaments around the Person and Work of Christ, will be vastly helped by this book. Anyone who wants to know whether he can expound the details of the Tabernacle with a clear conscience may go elsewhere for advice. J. A. MOTYER.

THE LATTER PROPHETS.
By T. Henshaw. (*George Allen & Unwin.*) 341 *pp.* 30/-.

Mr. Henshaw enters the field of Old Testament studies with a book that is admirably written but of only minor importance as a contribution to scholarship. It says little of what the author thinks but a great deal of what others have thought before him. It is a compressed account of how a number of scholars of the critical school have viewed the prophetical literature, so presumably the author is in full sympathy with their general standpoint. At any rate he nowhere reckons with the writings of the more conservative scholars, nor for that matter does he pay much regard to the deviationists from critical orthodoxy like Welch, and we were surprised to find mention of neither Guillaume nor Gunkel—presumably form-criticism is unacceptable to this critic—and only once or twice is there any reference to the Scandinavians, Mowinckel and Halder (*sic*). There is a lot of Driver, Skinner, and C. C. Torrey.

The book begins with a chapter on the prophetic literature in which the title of the book is defined and a sketch given of the stages through which the material passed between its origin and its written form. " Not all this material was genuine. Part of the oracular poetry . . . had been wrongfully ascribed, while the . . . narratives contained fictitious elements." The prophetic writers therefore represent a medley of fact and fiction, of authentic and unauthentic material.

Then follow an excellent chapter on the historical background, an illuminating section on archæology and the prophetic period, a cautious essay on prophetism, and a concise summary of Bishop Lowth

on the forms and characteristics of Hebrew poetry. Thereafter individual chapters deal with each of the prophets in chronological order, except that there are three Isaiahs and two Zechariahs.

This is all very correct and an accurate presentation of the older critical school, but somehow this book seems to accentuate the spiritual bankruptcy of the critical approach. By the time a prophet has been dealt with, one wonders what there genuinely is of his message, even though each chapter does have a section on the permanent influence of the prophecy concerned. Obadiah is treated thus (p. 269) : " We conclude that his influence has been harmful. . . . His work is pervaded by a spirit of hatred and revenge, and is far removed from the teaching of Jesus. . . ." This is surely not the kind of Bible that Lambeth has exhorted us to read.

The main virtue of this book, apart from its style and layout, is that the author includes under each prophet a full summary of the contents of the book named after him. Micah is condensed into three pages, Jeremiah into nineteen. These pages are really valuable.

The book concludes with some appendices on Israelite religious practices in which several Hebrew words are transliterated wrongly in the construct singular—" torath " for " torah " (p. 304), " bamath " (p. 307), and " hattath " (p. 308) similarly. The indices are incomplete in several details. J. B. TAYLOR.

PREACHING—THE ART OF COMMUNICATION.
By Leslie J. Tizard. (*George Allen & Unwin.*) 106 *pp.* 10/6.

The Rev. Leslie E. Cooke explains in a foreword to this book that it was published posthumously, and a concluding note makes it clear that the book was never finished. Mr. Tizard was hurrying to complete his work on his deathbed, but left some of his plan unaccomplished. He died at the comparatively early age of fifty-five, and the reader is bound to listen sympathetically to these words of a dying man.

The book has five chapters of unequal length, entitled What Preaching is, The Personality of the Preacher (I and II), the Art of Communication, and Pastoral Preaching. The book is not very happily named. It does not really discuss " the Art of Communication ", at least not in the technical sense. Nor is it exclusively about preaching. Rather is it a book about the minister's personal life and pastoral duties, with special reference to the task of preaching.

Taking Phillips Brooks' definition, " preaching is the bringing of truth through personality," Mr. Tizard's book is more concerned with the personality of man than with the truth of God. He quotes from a number of books on pastoral psychology and had himself previously written a book entitled *A Guide to Marriage.* In his two chapters on " The Personality of the Preacher " he lists the obstacles which " may be between the preacher and God, so that His truth is not received, or between the preacher and the congregation, so that it is not communicated " (p. 20). He goes on to write of the need for sincerity, love, authority, and self-acceptance, and of the temptations to which the minister is exposed, namely craving for power, love of praise, the dangers of self-display, and the satisfying of some emotional need.

There are two emphases which the present reviewer misses, firstly,

that the preacher is called to transmit a given word, and, secondly, that he must do so in the power of the Holy Spirit. In a book on preaching it is sad to find such scant attention given to both the Word of God and the Spirit of God. Mr. Tizard's doctrine of revelation and inspiration will not commend itself to evangelicals. According to him preachers can be " inspired ", while a Biblical prophet is only " a man of profound spiritual insight ". The Apostle Paul in 1 Corinthians 7: 12 and 40 makes " no claim to inspiration at all " (p. 114). The whole duty of the preacher is " listening for the voice of God ", and " as we study the word of God " is only one of many ways in which we hear God's voice (p. 15). Preaching is said to be " proclamation ", but as much a proclamation of our own experience of God as of " the historical facts through which God revealed Himself and acted for man's salvation ". Mr. Tizard has little conception of the preacher as a " steward of the mysteries of God ", required to be faithful to " the deposit ". Similarly, Mr. Tizard maintains that a preacher's authority resides neither in his office nor in his education, nor apparently in his message, but in his first-hand experience of what he is saying. Thus, the preacher is like Jesus and not like the scribes (p. 31).

Secondly, the very long chapter on the Art of Communication (45 pages out of 106) lists eight secrets of success. The preacher must " be sensitive to his congregation ", " make the congregation feel friendly towards him," " gain " and " hold the attention of his congregation ", " make every member of the congregation feel he is being addressed personally," etc., etc. All this is wise and helpful, but, strictly, it is advice applicable rather to " Public Speaking " than to " Preaching ". Is preaching an " art " with " rules " and a technique? No doubt it is in a sense, but one may be forgiven for wishing that the place and power of the Holy Spirit were more clearly recognized and more definitely stressed. J. R. W. Stott.

SERMONS FOR SPECIAL OCCASIONS.
By C. H. Spurgeon. (*Marshall, Morgan, & Scott.*) 15/-.

This is the first of twenty volumes which, under the general title of " The Kelvedon Edition ", will contain selections of Spurgeon's sermons on specific subjects such as Prayer, Soul-Winning, and Revival, and on such Biblical themes as the Parables, the Miracles, the Psalms, and the Second Coming.

The title of the present volume is perhaps the most intriguing; for, while Spurgeon was never tired of dilating on the folly of observing special days, he nevertheless was quick to make use of them—so much so, that one suspects that his protesting against times and seasons was done with his tongue in his cheek.

Whether or not this was in fact the case, Dr. Cook, the Consultant Editor of *The Christian*, who is responsible for the present selections, seems to have had no difficulty in finding in Spurgeon sermons firmly based on such occasions in the Christian Year as Advent, Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension Day, Whitsun, and even Mothering Sunday, besides the less ancient observances connected with the end of the old year and the beginning of the new, and harvest thanksgiving.

If Dr. Cook had been a member of the Church of England, he might well have moved the sermon selected for Christmas to the Epiphany, as the Scripture basis is St. Matthew, chapter 2, and he would then doubtless have found no difficulty in choosing another for Christmas ! Apart from that, his choice has been admirable, and he has made available a group of eighteen sermons so rich in exposition and spiritual insight that every minister of the Word who studies them will do so to the great benefit of his own soul and to the blessing of those to whom he ministers.

These beautifully produced volumes should prove a welcome addition to the library of any preacher who is not already possessed of more comprehensive editions of the sermons of this prince of preachers.

H. J. BURGESS.

THE MEETING OF LOVE AND KNOWLEDGE.
By Martin C. D'Arcy. (*George Allen & Unwin.*) 12/6.
MATTER, MIND, AND MAN.
By Edmund W. Sinnott. (*George Allen & Unwin.*) 18/-.

Some thinkers in the West, e.g., Aldous Huxley and also in the East, e.g., Dr. Coomaraswarmy, believe that there are common principles underlying all world religions, a sort of " highest common factor ", which if found and accepted would promote a better feeling among all men. Father D'Arcy, while sympathizing with these ideas, rejects them. Christianity is not just the highest religion so far evolved, and, hence, exhibiting kinship in origin and content with the others. It is *sui generis*. The Buddhist teaching on " love " extols charity as a means to an end, Nirvana. In Christianity love is giving, not getting, and involves seeking the good of others for its own sake. Love is an end in itself. Father D'Arcy desires a greater knowledge of world religions. If Christianity were fully understood its superiority would be manifest and conversion would result. His chapter on Mysticism, Eastern and Western, shows a thorough grasp of both types, their likenesses and differences.

In his review of Darwinism Professor Sinnott shows that human traits are in embryo in the lower animals. This leads to the theory that animals, including man can be explained by the laws of chemistry and physics. There is a fundamental antithesis extending through biology which results in conflicting ideas of man. Thus if life is rigid, determined, and mechanical evidently certain human values have no reality. Yet if we believe that mind, spirit, and freedom, for example, are really worthy of our allegiance then this throws doubt on that philosophy of the orderliness of nature which has been so productive in knowledge and happiness. This dilemma Dr. Sinnott sets himself to resolve. In doing so, he asserts the principle of organization or self-regulation, showing that it is present in the protoplasmic cell and persists throughout the build up of the complex being of man. In his review he treats such subjects as Spirit, Beauty, Right, The Divine Spirit, Sin, Pain and Evil, Life and Death, and concludes that only in God can man be fulfilled. This is a splendid contribution and whilst it is not orthodox religion it is something on which orthodox religion can build.

G. G. DAWSON.

CHURCH OF FREE MEN: BACKGROUND TO "LAMBETH, 1958". *By Gordon Hewitt. Highway Press. pp.* 59. 2/6.

"Lambeth" is here, set against the background of missionary enterprise, and particularly that of the Church Missionary Society. It opens with a dialogue between an enquirer and a Bishop about "Lambeth" and the Anglican Communion, and gives in succinct form information about the purpose and character of the Conference. There are valuable statistical tables at the end of the book, and questions for study are provided at the close of each chapter. (We wonder if this book would not have been of much greater usefulness if it had been published before the Conference rather than after it.) The theme is, as the title suggests, freedom, and we are shown how early missionary activity went hand in hand with the abolition of slavery, culminating in the consecration as bishop of Samuel Crowther, a freed African slave. The problem of unity in the field is considered and its subsequent development as seen in the Church of South India. The price to be paid for freedom is the subject of one chapter, and the final chapter is a summing-up which hints at dangers inherent in "federation".

If we may take the Commonwealth as a pattern in the secular sphere of the Anglican Communion in the spiritual realm, we note the independence of each member state developing within the family the form of government most suited to its people. India can be a Republic within the Commonwealth but that does not endanger our own loyalty and devotion to the Monarchy. Similarly, within the Anglican Communion the Church of England has its own tradition and history of more than a thousand years. This book rightly emphasizes the importance of allowing the indigenous churches to develop their own ethos; we must not force upon them our Western customs. But equally we must beware that our own heritage of freedom is not sacrificed to the entrancing vision of a vast world-wide Church. Already the big corporation is a feature of our age with its inevitable squeezing out of the "small man" and the loss of individuality. It is possible to be dazzled by the vastness of the Anglican Communion. The preponderance of overseas Bishops at "Lambeth" could threaten the freedom of our own Church here at home. While we rejoice to belong to a family of Churches throughout the world, our loyalty is not to the Anglican Communion but to our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the truth revealed in Holy Scripture. The Lambeth Quadilateral of 1888 keeps us on sure ground; one of its points is that the Holy Scriptures are the rule and ultimate standard of faith. T. G. MOHAN.

OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED

King of Kings. By Malcolm Saville. (*Nelson.*) pp. 264. 21/-. The story of Jesus retold for young people. The illustrations are excellent, and include two reproductions in colour of old masters and some twenty photographs in black and white of the Holy Land.

The Gods of the Greeks. By Carl Kerényi. (*A Pelican Book published by Penguin.*) pp. 271. 4/-. A valuable and comprehensive study of the deities of ancient Greece and the myths connected with them, by a noted Hungarian classical scholar. Illustrated.

The Theory of Evolution. By John Maynard Smith. (*A Pelican Book published by Penguin.*) pp. 320. 3/6.